This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

XCvm . d . 2

Digitized by Google

XL 17.1 WAR

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

5/-

Digitized by Google

A

VIEW

OF

LORD BOLINGBROKE'S

PHILOSOPHY;

In Four LETTERS to a FRIEND.

LETTERS FIRST and SECOND.

O PROCERES! Censore opus est, an Haruspice nobis?
JUV.

LONDON,
Printed for JOHN and PAUL KNAPTON, in *Ludgate-Street*. MDCCLIV.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

TO

***** ***** Esq.

DEAR SIR,

LORD BOLINGBROKE'S PHILOSOPHY, ſo much and ſo long talked of, is now come, and very fairly, into the hands of the Public. For I think it unjuſt to the Editor, to ſuppoſe his Lordſhip did not intend the World this LEGACY. His laſt Will ſufficiently ſhews us his kind intention. But it will be ſaid, he ſpeaks of it, as a thing compoſed only for the ſolace and admiration of a few friends in a corner [1]. What then? might not his Lordſhip change his mind, and extend his benefits? Hardly, you will ſay, without *contradicting* his profeſſed principles. So much the

[1] "Let us ſeek truth, but ſeek it quietly as well "as freely. Let us not imagine, like ſome who are "called FREE-THINKERS, that every man who can "think and judge for himſelf (as he has a right to do) "has therefore a right of SPEAKING, any more than of "*acting*, according to the full freedom of his thoughts. "The freedom belongs to him as a rational creature. "He lies under the reſtraint as a *member of Society*. "— As we think for ourſelves, we may keep our "thoughts to ourſelves or communicate them with a "DUE RESERVE, and in ſuch manner ONLY, as it "may be done without *offending the Laws of our Coun-* "*try, and diſturbing the public peace.*" — *Introductory Letter to Mr. Pope*, Vol. iii. p. 343. Quarto Edition.

better.

Digitized by Google

better. The publication then will be of a piece with the reſt. And never trouble your head with one *contradiction*, where you may meet with a thouſand.

Quid te exempta levat ſpinis de pluribus una?

Now tho' I know You have as little Curioſity to hear what a Freethinker can object to the FAITH which has got poſſeſſion of your heart, as what a Pick-pocket can chicane to the Property in your purſe: yet the name of L. BOLINGBROKE'S METAPHYSICS, (which, I think, were become as famous, and hitherto as little underſtood, as his POLITICS) cannot ſure but incline you to ſome ſlight acquaintance at leaſt with this FIRST PHILOSOPHY, as he calls it; and which, in the manner of other Conquerors, he erects on a general deſolation.

The only part of his Lordſhip's Character, that yet remained equivocal, was his LITERARY. How this will fare by the publication of his *Philoſophy*, I will not pretend to ſay; perhaps not altogether ſo well as his Friends might give him the pleaſure to expect. He frequently tells his reader, that the Doctrine of his ESSAYS and FRAGMENTS had been occaſionally thrown out amongſt them, and made the ſubject

Digitized by Google

ſubject of many free converſations. While haranguing in that circle, I will ſuppoſe he met with the applauſe he ſought for. But had he choſe to bring them to the bar of the Publick himſelf, he might have ſeen ſtrange revolutions. " Illic, et Judex *ta-*
" *cet*, et Adverſarius *obſtrepit*, et nihil TE-
" MERE DICTUM perit: et, ſiquid TIBI
" IPSE SUMAS, PROBANDUM EST: et,
" omiſſo MAGNA SEMPER FLANDI TU-
" MORE, loquendum eſt[1]." Indeed his Lordſhip could hardly expect to eſcape the ſeverity of this tribunal but by a very ſuperior merit: Since his meditations on divine matters are ſo extenſive, that ſcarce any one, who has written in defence of Virtue, or Religion, but will find himſelf either inſulted in his perſon or miſrepreſented in his opinions; and merely for being in his Lordſhip's way.

But ſure, when a man of his polite manners had condeſcended to enter into learned altercation, the world might at leaſt expect a Model for the *courtly management of Controverſy*: which, once for all, ſhould have either reformed, or ſhould for ever diſcredit the groſſer Polemics of

[1] Quint.

Digitized by Google

the Schools. So that tho' the DIVINE would expect no great *matter* from theſe *oracles of reaſon*, yet he would readily accept his amends in the *manner* of ſo elegant a pen. And perhaps you will think, Divines had been no loſers by this equivalent: You, who have obſerved that, in their commerce with the World, the chief difficulty lies in the *Forms:* Indeed, they have been generally thought wanting in them; whether their pride prompts them to appeal to the Authority of Reaſon; or their prudence teaches them to ſubmit to the Wiſdom of their Betters. And the management of their controverſies in the Schools, and the proſecution of their intereſts in Courts, have, on different accounts, been equally obnoxious to the cenſure of their adverſaries. I would willingly avoid both theſe extremes. For I would, if poſſible, preſerve and ſupport that love and reverence to an uſeful Body, which the noble Writer, relying, not on his own Politics, but on other men's, has, in his *fourth Eſſay*, devoted to Deſtruction. He, indeed, may call for aid on the *Secular arm*; he has the old reaſon for ſo doing; but, I dare ſay, the *Clergy* never will.

Digitized by Google

Things are now come to that paſs, that the State ſeems to be in more need of their Support, than They, of the State's. For, tho' the cavils of licentious men always end in the Confirmation of Truth and Virtue, yet they generally ſet out in looſening the hold, which Religion has on the PEOPLE. And when that is gone, what other Engine the Magiſtrate will invent, to keep the multitude in order, They, whoſe principal concern it is, would do well to conſider.

As I ſaid, then, I had taken it for granted, that our noble Adverſary, for an Adverſary he has condeſcended to be, and a warm conflict it is likely to prove, would be principally anxious to teach us in his writings, what was his wont in converſation, that ſtudied politeneſs, which is ſo well fitted to keep inferiors at a diſtance: And that, when he had declared mortal war againſt every thing the world hath hitherto called RELIGION; and againſt that Order, (call them as you will, PRIESTS, or MINISTERS) which all ſtates had thought proper to eſtabliſh, for the Support of it, we ſhould ſee his attack carried on by the faireſt as well as ſtrongeſt reaſoning, the

Digitized by Google

gentleſt as well as the firmeſt addreſs, and the politeſt as well as the keeneſt raillery.

But how was I diſappointed, to find this Conſervator of States, this Legiſlator in Philoſophy and Religion, utterly unable to raiſe his head above the rank contagion of the Schools: to ſee Polemics go their uſual train; and this Sun of our new Syſtem, whirled along the turbid vortex of controverſy, like any the moſt *ignoble* of the earthly Bodies! But his POET, or rather his *Prophet*, (who ſo magnificently announced to us the glad tidings of all theſe good things) had prepared us for it. He had contemplated this ſtrange phenomenon: not, indeed, without ſurprize. It is, ſays he,

——" mighty odd:
" A fit of vapours clouds this DEMI-GOD."

To be plain, I met with nothing in theſe big Volumes, but the rankneſs of SOUTH without his force; and the malignity of MARVEL without his wit. You ſhall not believe me on my own word: the evidence lies before us. Give me leave then to preſent you with a SPECIMEN, under his own hand, of his candour, his temper,

Digitized by Google

temper, and infinite politeneſs. And tho' one can but ill judge of the *harveſt* by a ſample of the field-flowers, yet we may form a pretty good gueſs of the *ſoil*.

Nor is this intemperance of language, of which I propoſe to give you a taſte, the mere eſcape of fancy or humour, which it would be charity to overlook: It is a ſort of *formula dicendi*, without which, all his Lordſhip's authentic acts of Legiſlation would be invalid: It is the very SPIRIT of his *new Religion*, without which, the whole would be indeed but a *dead letter*.

It was with the leſs reluctance I entered on this part of my deſign, that I might have to juſtify to the world the plainneſs and freedom with which I may hereafter chance to treat his Lordſhip's REASONING; (as you know I am ſometimes thinking to give it a thorough Examination;) for, the excellent Quintilian well obſerves, "Præ-"ſtatur hoc aliquando etiam DIGNITATI-"BUS ut libertatis noſtræ RATIO reddatur, "ne quis nos aut *petulantes* in lædendis his, "aut etiam *ambitioſos* putet."

Without any further preface, then, let the Shew begin: Only premiſing, that as his Lordſhip had a FIRST PHILOSOPHY to

Digitized by Google

erect, he had an immenſe deal of rubbiſh to remove: The rubbiſh of every great Name, and of every ſacred Order: all of which ſtood directly in his way.

With CUDWORTH he begins: and of CUDWORTH he ſays, *The heads of many reverend perſons have been turned by a preternatural fermentation of the brain, or a philoſophical delirium. None hath been more ſo than this divine* [1]. Again, CUDWORTH [in his INTELLECTUAL SYSTEM] *gives you little leſs than a nonſenſical paraphraſe of nonſenſe. It was not his fault. The good man paſſed his life in the ſtudy of an unmeaning jargon; and as he learned, he taught* [2].

To talk, like CUMBERLAND, *of promoting the good of the whole Syſtem of rational Agents, amongſt whom God is included, and of human benevolence towards him, is to talk metaphyſical jargon and theological blaſphemy* [3].

CLARKE *triumphs in this fooliſh and wicked rhodomontade, &c.* [4]—*All* CLARKE *ſays about the diſcovery of God's will, is a rhapſody of preſumptuous reaſoning and of*

[1] Vol. iii. p. 353. of his Works, in Quarto.
[2] Vol. iv. p. 92. [3] Vol. v. p. 82.
[4] Vol. v. p. 252.

prophane

Digitized by Google

prophane abſurdities [5]. — *Audacious and vain Sophiſt! His terms have a ſolemn air, that may impoſe on the unwary, and confirm the habitual prejudices of others; but more abſurdity cannot be ſtuffed into ſo few words* [6].

Declaiming againſt WOLLASTON, he ſays, *But I will detain you no longer about ſuch diſcourſe as would convince you, if you heard it at* MONROE'S, *that the Philoſopher who held it was a patient of the Doctor's not yet perfectly reſtored to his ſenſes* [7]. Again, of the ſame excellent Perſon, *We have here an example of the ſecond ſort of Madneſs mentioned above. The man who writ all this nonſenſe was a man of parts, — But when theſe learned Lunaticks, &c.* [8].

CLARKE and WOLLASTON are now grown outragious; and fit only to be chained together. So that henceforth they are rarely ſhewn aſunder. We ſometimes find them in the *height of a metaphyſical frenzy* [9]: And, by what one can ſee, without much provocation. They had proved the Soul to be a thinking ſubſtance diſtinct from Matter: And I

[5] Vol. v. p. 292. [6] Vol. v. p. 395.
[7] Vol. iii. p. 518. [8] Vol. v. p. 374.
[9] Vol. iii. p. 514.

Digitized by Google

don't know of any body, before his Lordſhip (who very civilly permitted them to enjoy the honour of it for life) that pretended to queſtion the *demonſtration*.

The Preſident FORBES is *really mad*; but it is only *quoad hoc*. For obſerve, he was *no Divine by profeſſion, but ſomething better* [10]. Indeed, not much. He was a LAWYER. Of which *unlearned* Profeſſion, as he calls it, *ninety nine in a hundred at leaſt*, (he ſays) *are Petty-foggers, Sharpers, Brawlers, and Cavillers* [11].

But, to give the better edge to his well-tempered language, he ſometimes dips it in irony: and then it is, *The good Earl of Nottingham*; and the *righteous Biſhop Sherlock*. They deſerved this compound abuſe. For the Firſt publickly defended, and ably too, that *Faith* which ſtands ſo much in his way: and the Other once ventured to oppoſe that *Party*, whoſe patronage he had then condeſcended to aſſume.

He comes next to the whole BODY of the Chriſtian Clergy. And now the *firſt Philoſophy* begins to work; and the taſk to grow ſerious. The PRIMITIVE SAINTS and DOCTORS have the precedence, as is fitting. "The liſt of MARTYRS conſiſt-

[10] Vol. v. p. 523. [11] Vol. ii. p. 353.

"ed

Digitized by Google

" ed, I believe, of thoſe who ſuffered for " BREAKING THE PEACE [11]. The PRI- " MITIVE CLERGY were, under pretence " of Religion, a very LAWLESS TRIBE [12]." " ALL the Chriſtian FATHERS uſing a DE- " LIRIOUS STYLE, it became that of Chri- " ſtian Theology [13.]" " It would ſcarce " be poſſible to believe that the greateſt " Saints and Doctors of the Church had " talked ſo much BLASPHEMOUS NONSENSE, " and employed ſo much *artifice* about it, " if their writings were not extant [14]." —" Of all this *abſurdity, prophaneneſs, and* " *ridicule*, they who built up Chriſtian " theology were guilty." You aſk, with impatience, What was this *abſurdity?* &c. He was going to tell you; for he never minces matters. " They ADDED (ſays he) " the EPISTLES to the GOSPELS; the doc- " trines of PAUL to thoſe of CHRIST; till " the APOCALYPSE became a part of our " holy Scriptures [15]." And now, I hope, you are ſatisfied; and ready for what he tells us was the reſult, That " Chriſtian " Divines and Philoſophers have done

[11] Vol. iv. p. 434. [12] Id. ib.
[13] Vol. iv. p. 612. [14] Vol. iv. p. 303.
[15] Vol. iv. p. 371.

" more

Digitized by Google

" more to DEBASE our notions of the ſu-
" preme Being, than all the Doctors of
" Polytheiſm [16]."

This was reaſonably well, for new-beginners: But nothing like the feats of MODERN DIVINES.

" It is MADNESS, *or ſomething* WORSE
" *than madneſs*, for Divines to imagine
" themſelves able to comprehend a whole
" Oeconomy of divine Wiſdom from *Adam*
" down to *Chriſt*. And yet this is ſo cuſ-
" tomary, that not only the learned and
" ingenious, but every dabbler in Theolo-
" gy, who muſt paſs for a *fool* or a *knave*
" whenever he grows extravagant, affects
" to reaſon in the ſame manner [17]."

—" Would Divines inſiſt chiefly on the
" external proofs of the authenticity of
" Scripture— they would avoid *a great deal*
" *of* BLASPHEMY [18]."— " They are ab-
" ſurd and licentious in urging both the
" external and internal evidence of Revela-
" tion [19]."

—" Our Divines turn themſelves to de-
" claim on certain and undoubted marks of
" the divine Authority of the Scriptures of

[16] Vol. iii. p. 541. [17] Vol. iv. p. 274.
[18] Vol. iii. p. 272. [19] Vol. iv. p. 273.

" the

Digitized by Google

" the Iſraelites—Let us compare ſome of " theſe ſuppoſed marks with thoſe of hu- " man original, and they will ſtare us in " the face, and point out plainly the FRAUD " and IMPOSTURE [20]."

— " It is common and yet aſtoniſhing to " obſerve, with how much ſolemnity and " confidence almoſt all thoſe who teach " and defend Chriſtianity, preſume to AF- " FIRM ANY THING, tho' never ſo evident- " ly FALSE [1]."

— " The beſt, and even ſuch as paſs for " the faireſt controverſial Writers, improve " by artifice the natural infirmity of the " human mind. They do, on purpoſe, " confound ideas and perplex the ſigni- " fication of ſigns—the moſt ſcandalous " frauds are applauded under the name of " ſubtilties. This I call theological fraud [2]." Hence, in another place, he ſays, that *folly and knavery prevail moſt amongſt Divines* [3], and again, that They are THE PLAGUES AND SCOURGES OF THE WORLD [4].

" The doctrine of Clarke and other " Chriſtian Divines about our obligation

[20] Vol. iii. p. 288.
[2] Vol. iii. p. 424—5.
[4] Vol. iv. p. 435.
[1] Vol. iv. p. 295.
[3] Vol. v. p. 6.

" to

Digitized by Google

" to imitate God is FALSE and PRO-
" PHANE [5]."

" Divines have IMPUDENTLY and
" WICKEDLY aſſumed, that there is a law
" of right reaſon common to God and
" man [6]."

" What I have advanced will be treated
" as an impious paradox by ſome of the
" trifling ſolemn dogmatiſts in Criticiſm and
" Theology, who have advanced ſo many
" *abſurd and impious* paradoxes of their
" own [7]."

We now come to what the noble author calls the DELIRIUM OF METAPHYSICAL THEOLOGY [8].— " The man who walk-
" ed ſoberly about in the Bedlam of Paris,
" and believed himſelf God the Father,
" was mad. Thus the Philoſopher, who
" takes a bold leap from a few clear and
" diſtinct ideas to the firſt principles of
" things, is *mad* [9]."

" The *reaſoners à priori* reſemble very
" much one ſort of MADMEN. Some of
" theſe are ſo VERY MAD that they loſe all
" uſe of their reaſon. Others again deduce

[5] Vol. v. p. 65.
[6] Vol. v. p. 77.
[7] Vol. v. p. 190.
[8] Vol. iii. p. 356.
[9] Vol. iv. p. 139.

" conſe-

Digitized by Google

" conſequences, and argue very juſtly, but " are STILL MAD: becauſe they reaſon " from principles that have no appearance " of reality out of their own overheated and " diſordered imaginations. You will find " inſtances of this kind, without the trou- " ble of going to *Bedlam*; but you will " find them principally in *Colleges* and " *Schools* [10]."

— " They deſerve to be treated like " patients proper for Dr. MONROE, and " to be put under his care. Nothing leſs " than *Metaphyſics* could have turned ſo " many good heads [11]."

Well then, Divines are all MAD; and, for fear of miſchief, in ſafe cuſtody. Sometimes indeed, his Lordſhip lets them out to cool, and air themſelves; nay, he is ſo good to give them their lucid intervals; but it is only to *play the rogue*, and to *cant in the pulpit*; and then, back again to their kennel, to *Monroe*, and his diſcipline; or, what is ſtill worſe, to his Lordſhip's; to hear themſelves called *Fools*, *Knaves*, *Cheats*, *mad men*, *Impoſtors*, and *Blaſphemers*. And, for theſe haſty changes of the Scene, he has contrived a moſt in-

[10] Vol. v. p. 369. [11] Vol. v. p. 417.

genious

Digitized by Google

genious expedient. He has divided the Clergy into the two claſſes of *Theologians* and *Metaphyſicians:* in the firſt of which, the KNAVE is predominant; in the ſecond, the MADMAN. So that he has of either ſort always ready, and at hand, juſt as he wants them. But as *Madmen* are much eaſier dealt with than *Knaves*, he has prepared one common BEDLAM for the reception of them all. *For God forbid* (he ſays) *he ſhould be as uncharitable as Divines*, to think they deſerved a worſe place, *as blaſpheming in their ſenſes* [12]. Good man! How ſhall the clergy expreſs their thanks to him for ſo much Charity? Alas! he thinks not of it: his *modeſty* is ſtill greater than his charity: and he is only anxious not to be miſunderſtood; and leſt Divines ſhould take his honeſt freedom in dudgeon. Nay, he is even ready to fear, that it may poſſibly *procure him, in return, ſome eccleſiaſtical* BILLINSGATE; *to be called infidel, deiſt, and perhaps atheiſt. My reply* (ſays he) *to* SO ANGRY *Diſputants ſhould be* CALM, AND SUCH AS MIGHT TEACH CHARITY *to thoſe who preach it ſo much, and practiſe it ſo little* [13]. To ſay the truth, his Lord-

[12] Vol. iv. p. 464. [13] Vol. iv. p. 225.

ſhip

Digitized by Google

ſhip ſeems, like (JUSTICE SHALLOW in the Play) to be ſuſpicious of thoſe he had ſo well entertained. *Davy*, (ſays the Juſtice, ſpeaking of his Court-Gueſts) *be civil to theſe Knaves, for they will* BACK-BITE. *Not worſe than they are* BITTEN (replies Davy) *for they have marvelous foul linen.* Whether his Lordſhip found the *Prieſt's Surplice* in this condition, or whether he left it ſo, is not material. No marvel at it's evil plight, when it has been ſo long over-run with Vermin; ſuch as Toland, Chub, Morgan; and thoſe who have been ſince bred out of them.

The BILLINGSGATE, however, if we give but equal credit to what we *hear* of the Clergy, and to what we *ſee* of his Lordſhip, lies pretty nearly between them. Admit, they have both their ſhare: yet, I agree with the right Honourable Author, it becomes the reverend Clergy much leſs than it does him. They are *Diſputants*; he is an *Orator*. Their proper buſineſs is to *reaſon*; his proper buſineſs is to *rail*. While each confines himſelf to his province, every thing goes well. But ſhould they change weapons; ſhould the Orator attempt to reaſon,

Digitized by Google

and the Diſputant be provoked to rail, all would be out of order. I venture, on the authority of Quintilian, to reckon *railing* amongſt the ARTS of Eloquence. "CONVI-"TIIS implere VACUA cauſarum," ſays this able Rhetor. It is true he holds it to be of the leſs perfect kind—"eſt enim pror-"ſus CANINA ELOQUENTIA." But his Lordſhip might reaſonably think, that his *Dog-Eloquence*, was well enough fitted to their *Dog-Logic*. However, Quintilian would not overload this ſpecies of Eloquence, nor would I; tho' neither of us be much diſpoſed to extol it. He confeſſes there is yet a ranker kind. "Sed hæc mi-"nora ſunt ILLO VITIO ANIMI, quo MALE-"DICUS a MALEFICO non diſtat, niſi OCCA-"SIONE." "In which, ſays he, nothing but "*opportunity* is wanting to make the *evil-*"*ſpeaker* an *evil-doer*." But the *Miniſter of State* muſt join the *Orator* before this can be brought about: juſt as the DIVINE and ATHEIST muſt *conſpire* to make that ARTIFICIAL BLASPHEMY which, his Lordſhip aſſures us, has eaten into the very vitals of Religion.

But the mention of this CONSPIRACY reminds

Digitized by Google

minds me that it is now high time to give you ſome account of it.

Hitherto we have only the out-lines, or, at moſt the general air of this *Clerical Portrait*; all he could catch at the firſt ſitting. A horrid combination finiſhes the Picture: a CONFEDERACY BETWEEN DIVINES AND ATHEISTS, *to diſhonour and degrade the God of the univerſe.* This is the ſtriking feature; and ſo artificially diſpoſed, that, turn the Portrait what way you will, it has ſtill a *plotting*, which in his Lordſhip's juſtice, is little better than a *hanging look.*

A confederacy ſo monſtrous, ſo mad, ſo portentous, may perhaps ſtartle you at firſt. But don't be frightened. Take my word for it, it will come to nothing. It is a Treaty of his own making. And you have heard enough of his talents for this ſort of buſineſs. He could reconcile the moſt unnatural alliances to the delicacy of his *morals*; and the moſt ridiculous miſcarriages to the ſuperiority of his *Politics.* But a *confederacy between Divines and Atheiſts!* you ſay.—Was any thing ſo odious! What think you, I pray, of that

Digitized by Google

blind bargain he once drove between certain of King George's Proteſtant Subjects, and a Popiſh Pretender? How *that* came to nothing, he has not thought fit to tell us, in his curious account of that matter [18]. But, as to *this* confederacy, I may have an opportunity of ſhewing you, that, after all his pains to form it, he betrayed and diſſolved it, himſelf. At preſent, my buſineſs is only to ſhew you what he *ſays* of it.

" After pleading the cauſe of natural " and revealed Religion, I am to plead " the cauſe of God himſelf, againſt DI- " VINES AND ATHEISTS IN CONFEDERA- " CY [19].

" The conduct of Chriſtian Divines has " been ſo far from defending the Provi- " dence of God, that they have joined in " the clamour againſt it. Nothing has " hindered, even thoſe who pretend to be " his Meſſengers, his Embaſſadors, his " *Plenipotentiaries*, from renouncing their " allegiance to him, as they themſelves have

[18] See the whole Letter to Sir W. Windham.
[19] Vol. v. p. 305.

" the

Digitized by Google

" the FRONT TO AVOW, but the hypothe-
" ſis of a future ſtate. On this hypotheſis
" alone they inſiſt; and therefore if this
" will not ſerve their turn, God is diſowned
" by them, as effectually as if he was ſo, in
" terms [20]." " Divines, if not Atheiſts,
" yet are ABETTERS of Atheiſm [1]."

" That there were ſome men, who
" knew not God in all ages may be true:
" but the ſcandalous taſk of COMBATING
" HIS EXISTENCE under the mark of
" Theiſm, was reſerved for Metaphyſici-
" ans and Theologians [2]."

—" Divines are ſtill more to be blamed.
" A CONFEDERACY WITH ATHEISTS be-
" comes ill the profeſſors of Theiſm.
" No matter. They PERSIST, and have
" done their beſt, in concert with their
" allies, to DESTROY the belief of the good-
" neſs of God:—They endeavour to DE-
" STROY that of his goodneſs, which is a
" farther article of their Alliance [3]."

" The CONFEDERACY between Atheiſts
" and Divines appears to have been carried

[20] Vol. v. p. 487—8.
[1] Vol. v. p. 485.
[2] Vol. v. p. 307.
[3] Vol. v. p. 393.

Digitized by Google

" VERY FAR—Nay the Atheiſt will ap-
" pear, to that reaſon, to which they both
" appeal, more conſiſtent in his abſurdity
" than the Divine [4]." " Divines UPBRAID
" God's goodneſs, and CENSURE his Juſ-
" tice [5]."— " INJUSTICE is, in this life,
" aſcribed to God, by Divines [6]."

" The whole Tribe of Divines, like
" Wollaſton and Clarke, do, in effect RE-
" NOUNCE the God, whom you and I
" adore, as much as the rankeſt of the
" Atheiſtical Tribe. Your Prieſts and our
" Parſons will exclaim moſt pathetically,
" and RAIL OUTRAGEOUSLY at this aſſer-
" tion. But have a little patience, and I
" will prove it to their ſhame to be
" true [7]."

This is bold: but he knew there was no danger. Theſe *Prieſts* and *Parſons*, as he tells us, are mere ORTHODOX BULLIES, *who affect to triumph over men who employ but part of their ſtrength; tire them with* IMPERTINENT PARADOXES; *and provoke them by* UNJUST REFLECTIONS, *and often, by the* FOULEST LANGUAGE [8].

[4] Vol. v. p. 348—9.
[5] Vol. v. p. 417.
[6] Vol. v. p. 541.
[7] Vol. v. p. 485.
[8] Vol. iii. p. 273.

Now,

Digitized by Google

Now, on a man of his Lordſhip's profeſſed moderation, as well as *concealed ſtrength*, who, (as himſelf aſſures us) *ſets an example of candour* [9], theſe *orthodox Bullies* can have no hold. For, as *impudent* as they are, they can never *have the face* to call *this confederacy with Atheiſts* an IMPERTINENT PARADOX; this attempt *to decry God's providence, to blot out his attributes of goodneſs and juſtice, to combat his exiſtence, and finally to renounce him*, an UNJUST REFLECTION: or that the names, he gives them, of *madmen, fools, knaves, blaſphemers*, is FOUL LANGUAGE. But then you aſk, what ſort of eloquence is it, with which theſe *Orthodox Bullies* contrive to RAIL OUTRAGEOUSLY, and yet employ none of his Lordſhip's flowers of ſpeech? Now, tho' this ſpecimen of his *Lordſhip's* eloquence, was what I owed to his inimitable pen; I have not the ſame obligation, nor ſhall have the ſame complaiſance, to the *Divines*.

You will forgive me, I dare ſay, if I rather chuſe, to vindicate them from the horrid calumny of this imaginary confede-

[9] Vol. iv. p. 548.

Digitized by Google

racy; even tho' I go a little out of my way to do it. To ſay the truth, the charge is too ſerious to be paſſed over with the ſame lightneſs I am diſpoſed to treat the reſt of his Lordſhip's foul Language. Beſides, I ſhould be aſhamed to do nothing but trifle; tho' his Lordſhip (as his friend Pope predicted of him [10]) affords none but trifling occaſions.

Be pleaſed then to underſtand, that ATHEISM ever endeavoured to ſupport it ſelf, on a FACT, which has indeed all the certainty that the evidence of ſenſe can give it; namely *the irregular diſtribution of moral good and evil.*

—" Cum res hominum tanta caligine volvi
" Adſpicerem, *lætoſque diu florere nocentes,*
" *Vexarique pios*—— labefacta cadebat
" RELLIGIO,"—

was the common language of the impatient ſufferer. From hence the Atheiſt inferred, that things were without an intelligent Ruler; driven about by that Fate or For-

[10] IF EVER LORD B. TRIFLES, IT MUST BE WHEN HE TURNS A DIVINE. Pope's Works, Vol. IX. Letter 14.

tune,

Digitized by Google

tune, which firſt produced them. DIVINES oppoſed this *concluſion*: for they did not venture to be ſo paradoxical as, with his Lordſhip, to call in queſtion *the premiſſes*, a phenomenon which objected itſelf to all their ſenſes. They demonſtrated, STRICTLY DEMONSTRATED, the Being of a God, and his moral attributes. And then ſhewed, that if the whole of man's exiſtence were included in this life, the preſent diſtribution of moral good and evil would contradict that demonſtration. They, therefore, inferred, on their part, that the whole was not included in this life: but that man was reſerved for a future reckoning; in which, an equal diſtribution of rewards and puniſhments will amply vindicate the providence of a righteous Governor.

But *Atheiſts* were not the only enemies *Divines* had to do with. There was a ſet of men, who allowed an intelligent firſt Cauſe, endowed with thoſe moral attributes, which Divines had demonſtrated. And, on that account, called themſelves DEISTS. Yet they agreed ſo far with *Atheiſm*, as to confine the whole of man's exiſtence to the preſent life. Theſe, the Divines com-

Digitized by Google

combated in their turn; and with the same arms; but in an inverted order. In disputing with the *Atheist*, the principle held in common, was *the present unequal distribution of Good and Evil.* So that to cut off their conclusion from it, of NO GOD, they proved his *being and attributes:* and from that proof inferred that the inequality would be set right. With the *Deist*, the common principle was *the being and attributes of God.* Therefore, to bring them to the allowance of a FUTURE STATE, they proved the present *unequal distribution* of good and evil; and from thence inferred, that there must be such a State.

This is a plain and true account of the contest with ATHEISTS and DEISTS, in which the subject of *a future state* came in question: In either controversy, it is *deduced from the moral attributes:* only with this difference, In the dispute with Atheists, the demonstration of those attributes is *made*; in the dispute with Deists it is *allowed.* The final purpose against Atheism is to prove the BEING AND ATTRIBUTES of God; against Deism to prove a FU-

Digitized by Google

a FUTURE STATE: For neither *natural* nor *revealed* Religion can ſubſiſt without *believing that God* IS, *and that he is a* REWARDER of them *that ſeek him* [11]. Thus, we ſee, the *queſtion*, in either controverſy, being different; the *premiſſes*, by which they were to be proved, muſt needs be different. The difference is here explained: the premiſſes, in the argument with Atheiſts, were the *moral attributes*; the premiſſes in the argument with Deiſts, the *unequal diſtribution* of good and evil.

Who now would have expected to ſee calumny either thrive or riſe on ſo unpromiſing a ground: or a writer bold enough to tell the World, that this conduct of the DIVINES was a CONFEDERACY *with* ATHEISTS, *to decry God's providence; to blot out his attributes of goodneſs and juſtice; to combat his Government; and to deny his very exiſtence?* The RIGHT HONOURABLE Author does all this; and more;—He hopes to be believed. It is true, this is a fine believing age: Yet I hardly think he would have puſhed his confidence in it's credulity ſo far, had he himſelf

[11] St. Paul.

ſeen

Digitized by Google

ſeen his way clear before him. His Lordſhip is always ſublime, and therefore often cloudy; commonly at too great a diſtance to ſee into the detail of things, or to enter into their *minutiæ:* for which, indeed, he is perpetually felicitating his genius: So that, in his *general view* of Theologic matters, he had jumbled the two controverſies together; and, in the confuſion, has commodiouſly ſlipped in one fact for another. He, all the way, repreſents Divines as making A FUTURE STATE THE PROOF OF GOD'S MORAL ATTRIBUTES: Whereas, we now ſee, on the very face of the controverſy, that they make THE MORAL ATTRIBUTES A PROOF OF A FUTURE STATE. Let us conſider how the diſpute ſtands with *Atheiſts.* Theſe men draw their argument againſt a God, from the condition of the moral world: The Divine anſwers, by *demonſtrating* God's Being and Attributes: and, on that demonſtration, ſatisfies the objection. Conſider how it ſtands with the *Deiſt.* Here, God's Being and Attributes is a common principle: And on this ground the Divine ſtands, to deduce a *future ſtate* from

Digitized by Google

from the unequal diſtribution of things. How then was it poſſible, you will aſk, it ſhould be as his Lordſhip pretends; and is perpetually repeating; namely, that *Divines make a future ſtate the proof of God's moral attributes?* What tell you me, of *poſſible?* It was *neceſſary*. It was to ſupport his ſlander of a CONFEDERACY. There was no room to pretend that God's Being and attributes were made precarious, by proving a *future ſtate*, from them: But could he get it believed, that Divines proved the Being and attributes from a *future ſtate*, he would eaſily find credit with his *kind readers*, for the reſt.

Well then, the whole amount of his CHIMERICAL CONFEDERACY riſes to this, That *Divines and Atheiſts hold a principle in common*; but in common too with all the reſt of mankind; namely, that there are irregularities in the diſtribution of moral good and evil. His Lordſhip has been angry with all POLITICAL, as well as all RELIGIOUS Parties in their turns. Suppoſe he had taken it into his head to ornament a CRAFTSMAN with the detection of a *political confederacy* between the WHIGGS and JACOBITES, to dethrone KING

Digitized by Google

GEORGE; becauſe both denied that he reigned *jure divino:* Would not *Mother Oſborne* have ſmiled through all her gravity; and told him that the *Whiggs* urged this common principle to ſupport their Monarch's title againſt *indefeaſible hereditary right?* And is it not as evident that, in this pretended *anti-theological conſpiracy*, *Divines* employed the other common principle, to ſupport Religion againſt *Atheiſm and Deiſm!* But whatever his Lordſhip might think proper to diſguiſe in this reaſoning, there is one thing the moſt careleſs Reader will never overlook; which is, that, under all this pomp of words and ſolemnity of accuſation, lies lurking the pooreſt ſpecies of a Bigot's calumny; which too is perpetually betraying itſelf in the *meanneſs* of miſrepreſentation, and the *rancour* of abuſive language. For it is the Bigot's practice, from *one* principle held in common, to charge his Adverſary with *all* the follies or impieties of an obnoxious Party. This miſerable artifice had been now long hiſſed out of learned controverſy, when the noble Lord took it up; and, with true political ſkill, worked it into a

SHAM

Digitized by Google

SHAM PLOT; to make RELIGION diſtruſt it's beſt Friends, and take refuge in the FIRST PHILOSOPHY.

TINDAL and COLLINS were manly Adverſaries. They knew how to invent, to purſue, and to puſh an argument againſt Religion. But what does this noble Writer know — His friends will tell you. They admire him for his wit and eloquence. But his friends admire, where You and I ſee nothing but an inflamed ſpirit, and an inflated ſtyle.

But he has not yet done with the CHRISTIAN CLERGY. What remained behind was to collect together his ſcattered abuſe; and to pour it all at once on that venerable Body, with as unfeeling a hand, as unrelenting heart.

" Nothing more (ſays he) will be want-
" ing to anſwer all the ends of *artificial*
" *Theology*, than to aſſume that they who
" miniſter in holy things are the *Omrahs*,
" the *Vizirs* and the *Baſſas* of THIS MIGH-
" TY KING, whoſe commands they pub-
" liſh, interpret, and execute, or cauſe to
" be executed, rather than his EMBASSA-
" DORS: by aſſuming which latter charac-
" ters,

" ters, they ſeem to leſſen, over modeſtly,
" the dignity of their own order, and to
" raiſe that of the Laity too high: BUT I
" AM ASHAMED TO HAVE SAID SO MUCH
" ON THIS SUBJECT [12]."

This is, indeed, as he ſays of them, *ever modeſt*. But they will be ready to reply in the words of the Poet,

" Let SHAME come when it will, we
" do not call it".

Beſides, after what has paſſed, I ſee nothing he need be *aſhamed of*; unleſs it be for ſtealing the paultry joke of *Embaſſadors* and *Plenipotentiaries* [13] from Lord Shaftſbury: which, if it but contribute to ſupport his character for *Wit*, I think, may be eaſily forgiven.

" Far be it from me (purſues this Right
" Honourable Perſon) and from every lover
" of Truth and common ſenſe, to wiſh that
" the race of Metaphyſicians and Caſuiſts
" ſhould increaſe, or ſo much as continue.
" But ſince there are, have been, and will

[12] Vol. v. p. 540—1.
[13] See p. 20. of this Letter.

" be

" be ſuch men in all ages, it is very rea-
" ſonable to wiſh that they may ſerve to
" the ſame good purpoſe that the HELOTES,
" the DRUNKEN SLAVES did at Sparta;
" and that their DELIRIUM, inſtead of im-
" poſing on others, and even infecting ma-
" ny, may be at length LAUGHED OUT of
" the world [10]." What pity is it his Lordſhip himſelf had not tried this expedient; (whoſe efficacy, other Lords of better temper, ſo kindly recommend and practiſe [11],) and employed his great *wit* to laugh the Clergy out of the world, rather than his *eloquence* to ſcold them out of it. He may rail, thro' all his figures, at *the impertinence of Logic, the futility of Metaphyſics, the fraud of Diſputation, and the blaſphemy of Divinity* [12]. Theſe are the arms of impotent, hyſterical Women when they want to have their will. After the long labours of a HOOKER, a STILLINGFLEET, a CUDWORTH, a SPENCER, a TILLOTSON, and a CLARKE, the Engliſh Clergy may anſwer his Lordſhip, in the words of *De Roſny*, as I think the ſtory goes, to ſome

[10] Vol. v. p. 446. [11] See their *Eſſays*, of paſt and preſent date, *in the freedom of wit and humour.*
[12] Vol. iv. p. 353.

Digitized by Google

old Ladies of the *League*, who, when HENRY IV. had got poſſeſſion of Paris, were one day very *eloquent* in their invectives againſt him, "Good ancient Gentlewomen, ſaid this rough old Soldier) ſpare your breath, and ſet your hearts at reſt, for MY MASTER is not a man to be ſcratched and ſcolded out of his KINGDOM."

But when, between his malice and his magic, he had transformed the CLERGY into *drunken ſlaves*; you muſt not think he would neglect to expoſe them to his NOBLE SPARTANS, in this condition. He hath not envied his Friends their entertainment: and no coſt is ſpared of laviſh expreſſion to ſet out theſe drunken revels. "The Choirs of birds (ſays he) "who whiſtle and ſing, or ſcream at "one another, or herds of beaſts who "bleat and low, or chatter and roar, at one "another, have juſt as much meaning and "communicate it as well --- Such is the "common converſation — Such, too, for "the moſt part, are all the public diſcourſes "that are held, and the ſolemn harangues "of the Pulpit [13]."

[13] Vol. iii. p. 422—3.

Digitized by Google

After ſo large a collection of his Lordſhip's flowers of ſpeech, you will diſpenſe with me from gathering up his looſer ends; ſuch as, *abſurdity*, *effronderie*, *knavery*, *folly*, *nonſenſe*, *delirium*, *frenzy*, *lunacy*, *downright madneſs*, *impiety*, *prophaneneſs*, *blaſphemy*, and *atheiſm:* which, like ſeed-pearl, are every where ſcattered over the embroidery of his eloquence.

But when I review this torrent of ribaldry, ſtrong enough to overlay an Oyſter-wench, I am apt, with indignation, to aſk,

An quæ
Turpia cerdoni, Voleſos Brutumq; decebunt?

but ready, however, in charity to ſuſpect, that even as his Lordſhip gave to BOWNCE, his friend's dog, the ſentiments of his maſter [14], ſo his Lordſhip's Secretary, who attended to two at once, his Lordſhip and his Lordſhip's PARROT, might unaware put

[14] *The world* (ſays his Lordſhip to Pope) *is as well fitted for* BOWNCE *as for* YOU, *with reſpect to phyſical nature; and with reſpect to* MORAL *nature,* BOWNCE *has little to do beyond hearkning to the* STILL WHISPERS, *the* SECRET SUGGESTIONS, *and the* SUDDEN INFLUENCES *of inſtinct.* Vol v. p. 467. This, the Reader ſees, is intended for a compliment

Digitized by Google

down to his Lord, what indeed belonged to the Favorite: who, however *eloquent* he might be, yet, we are told, was *no Philoſopher*.

The Coxcomb bird, ſo talkative and grave,
That from his cage cries *cuckold*, *whore* and *knave*,
Tho' many a paſſenger he rightly call,
We hold him NO PHILOSOPHER at all."

And I the rather ſuppoſe the Secretary to be here in fault, ſince his Lordſhip, in one place, ſeems to think, that ribaldry and ill language diſgrace the *animal implume bipes*, the *two-leg'd unfeathered Philoſopher*. For, ſpeaking of SPINOZA and HOBBES, he ſays, *Let it not be ſaid, they are men of* DEPRAVED UNDERSTANDINGS, AND DEPRAVED MORALS; THIS IS TO RAIL, NOT TO ARGUE.

To *rail*, then, when we ſhould *argue*, in his Lordſhip's opinion, is a fault. Unleſs

on the following ſtanza of his Friend's *Univerſal prayer*.

"Where I am right, THY GRACE IMPART,
"Still in the right to ſtay;
"Where I am wrong, O TEACH MY HEART
"To find that better way."

you

Digitized by Google

you will ſuppoſe, theſe two *atheiſts* were eſpecially favoured, becauſe not found in bad Company; wickedly CONFEDERATING with *Divines* and *Metaphyſicians*.

Seriouſly, as good men may be ſcandalized to find their Paſtors accuſed and convicted of *blaſphemy* and *prophaneneſs*; (for in his Lordſhip's proceſs the proof is always included in the charge) it will be but right to tell the plain truth: which is no more than this, that his Lordſhip is very apt to annex *new ideas*, to *old words*; and not very apt to give us notice of his handy-work. As in the caſe before us, Who would ſuſpect, that teaching, a *law of right reaſon, common to God and man*; and inforcing *man's obligation to imitate God*, were BLASPHEMY *and* PROPHANENESS? Yet ſuch they are; or his Lordſhip's word is not to be taken [16].

So then, as what has hitherto been eſteemed *Piety* is become *Blaſphemy*; we need not wonder if his Lordſhip ſhould turn

[16] *Divines have impudently and wickedly aſſumed that there is a Law of right reaſon common to God and man.* Vol. v. p. 77.—And again, TO PREACH UP THE OBLIGATION OF IMITATING GOD IS FALSE AND PROPHANE. Vol. v. p. 65.

Digitized by Google

old thread-bare blaſphemy, into a new habit of piety: and this may be as proper to be obſerved, leſt the ſame good men ſhould be too much ſhocked at the horror of what comes next: For now his Lordſhip falls, with the ſame ſpirit, or, if you will, with his uſual *wit and eloquence*, upon the TWO REVELATIONS and their FOUNDERS. And here, his *piety* pretends ſo much to the impulſe of conſcience, that you would ſuſpect he thought himſelf, like St. PAUL, under the malediction of a woe if he *preached not his new Goſpel.*

Of MOSES, he ſays, "It is impoſſible to "excuſe all the puerile, romantic, and ab-"ſurd circumſtances in the author of the "Book of Geneſis, which nothing could "produce but the habit of dealing in tri-"fling traditions, and a moſt profound ig-"norance. It is impoſſible to read what "he has writ on this ſubject without feel-"ing contempt for him as a philoſopher, "and horror as a Divine [17]."

"The PENTATEUCH has ſuch evident "marks of falſehood, as can be objected "to no other writings, except to pro-

[17] Vol. iii. p. 233.

"feſs'd

Digitized by Google

" feſs'd Romances, nor even always to " them [18]."

" We may laugh at Don Quixote, for " reading Romances till he believed them " to be true hiſtories, and for quoting " Archbiſhop Turpin with great ſolem- " nity; but when Divines ſpeak of the " PENTATEUCH as of an Authentic Hi- " ſtory, and quote Moſes as ſolemnly as " he did Turpin, are they much leſs mad " than he was [19]?" *Don Quixote* is his Lordſhip's favorite ſimile; and comes as often over as either the *Aſs* or *Lion* in Homer. If I was not half aſhamed of uſing what has been ſo long hacknied both by Wits and Blockheads, I ſhould be tempted to borrow this ſimile; and with the leſs ſcruple, as his Lordſhip ſets me the example. What then, if I tried to apply it, for once? It ſhall ſuffer nothing in my hands; but be returned ſafe again to his Lordſhip, to joke with to the end of the chapter.

Whoever attentively conſiders his Lordſhip's ESSAYS, will, I dare ſay, be of my mind, That the much reading *his maſter* LOCKE, who was deeply engaged with

[18] Vol. iii. p. 271. [19] Vol. iii. p. 280.

Digitized by Google

School-divines and Metaphyſicians, had the ſame effect on his Lordſhip's temper, then in an advanced age, and under a bilious habit, that the reading books of Chivalry had on the prudent Gentleman of La Mancha. And, by his own confeſſion, *a man's head is ſoon turned by complex and abſtract ideas.* From henceforth the gigantic Forms of *Schoolmen* and the enchantments of *Metaphyſical Divines* got entire poſſeſſion of his Fancy. Conſider what you can make of the following remark, without ſuppoſing with me, that theſe *mormos* had made a very deep impreſſion. "*That* THEOLOGY, "ſays he, which pretends to deduce the "duties of man from ſpeculations con- "cerning the *moral attributes of God*, is to "be reckoned in the claſs with NATURAL "MAGIC [20]."

If you ſeek, I do not ſay for the *elegance*, but for the *common propriety* of this obſervation, any where out of his Lordſhip's own imagination, you will ſeek for it in vain. Yet, allow him but his *Theological Magicians*, and you ſee, their *theology* can be nothing elſe than *natural magic*.

[20] Vol. iv. p. 621.

So

Digitized by Google

So again, when he ſays — *Clarke ſhall not force me into Atheiſm; no nor Wollaſton neither*; What is this, but *Don Quixote*, up and down? dreadfully afraid that theſe Necromancers would, at laſt, force him into their enchanted caſtle of a FUTURE STATE; raiſed, as he tells us, between *Divines and Atheiſts in confederacy.*

Indeed, every Reader muſt have obſerved this unaccountable rage and horror whenever a DIVINE comes croſs his Lordſhip's fancy. One would think, they had ſerved him the trick, the Enchanters plaid Don Quixote; that they had run away with his *Library*, and walled up his *Study-door*. Moſt true it is, that not long before this immenſe Treaſure of the *firſt Philoſophy* was given to the world, certain of theſe wicked Magicians had turned it all into *fairie-favours:* And the public on it's appearance found nothing better proved than the truth of the old proverb, *Pro Theſauro, Carbones.*

Let us be thankful, however, for what we have. And indeed, if I was not perfectly ſatisfied that no man in his ſenſes could miſtake the value of this *new Money*, I ſhould make a ſcruple of laying ſo much of it

Digitized by Google

it before him; eſpecially the following *pieces*, which have an uncommon glow, as if they came hot from the place where they were minted.

" THE WHOLE SYSTEM OF THE LAW " OF MOSES, like the whole ſyſtem of his " conduct, WAS FOUNDED ON MURDER[1].

" The *Jews* blended together, at once, " in the moral character of God, injuſtice, " cruelty, and partiality. They made him " an object of terror more than of awe " and reverence; and their Religion was " a Syſtem of the RANKEST SUPERSTI- " TION [2]."

" The JEWS with more inconſiſtency, " and not leſs profanation, than the Pa- " gans, dreſſed up the one ſupreme Being " in all the rags of humanity; which " compoſed a kind of motley Character, " ſuch as fooliſh Superſtition, and mad " Enthuſiaſm alone could aſcribe to him; " and ſuch as no man who believes him " an all-perfect being can hear without " horror [3]."

" The Jews give ſuch notions of the ſu- " preme Being as no People on earth, but

[1] Vol. v. p. 183. [2] Vol. v. p. 531.
[3] Vol. v. p. 529.

" this

Digitized by Google

" this, would have aſcribed, I do not ſay " to God, but to the worſt of thoſe mon- " ſters, who are ſuffered or ſent by God, " for a ſhort time, to puniſh the iniquity " of men [4]."

From MOSES and JUDAISM, his Lordſhip deſcends to PAUL and CHRISTIANITY. Let us ſee whether he gives Them better quarter.

" CHRISTIANITY abrogated the *Law*, " and confirmed the *hiſtory of Moſes*; from " the times, at leaſt, when St. PAUL un- " dertook, like a true cabaliſtical Archi- " tect, with the help of type, and figure, " to raiſe a new Syſtem of religion on the " old foundations [5]." " The Goſpel of " CHRIST is one thing; the Goſpel of St. " PAUL another [6]." " He preached a " Goſpel in contradiction to CHRIST's, and " directly repugnant to it [7]."

On this account, I ſuppoſe, it was, that he dignifies PAUL, with the elegant appellation of the LEATHER-DRESSING PONTIFF. But the immediate occaſion of his conferring this new title on him, was particularly happy. His Lordſhip was on a favorite topic, he was abuſing the firſt Meſſengers

[4] Vol. v. p. 515. [5] Vol. iii. p. 288.
[6] Vol. iv. p. 313. [7] Vol. iv. p. 326—7.

of

Digitized by Google

of the Goſpel, for their claim to maintenance. He was conſcious, PAUL came not within his cenſure. So that, leſt this ſhould give the Apoſtle too much credit; he informs the reader, in his polite way [8], that he had a *trade*, and could ſhift for himſelf. For it ſeems, nothing but downright ſtarving will acquit the Apoſtles of theft and extortion, before his Lordſhip's Tribunal.

" JESUS (in his opinion) had no intention of ſpreading his Religion further than amongſt the *Jews*; but PAUL, bred at the feet of Gamaliel, ſaw further than that poor ignorant fiſherman Peter." The ſenſe requires you ſhould read, *that poor ignorant Carpenter Jeſus:* and ſo without doubt his Lordſhip deſigned his compliment. Well, but what did PAUL ſee further? It was this, " That the contempt and averſion in which both the nation and the Religion of the Jews were held by the reſt of mankind, would make it much more eaſy to convert the Gentiles at once to Chriſtianity, than to make them Jews firſt, in order to make them Chriſtians afterwards [9]."

[8] Vol. iv. p. 423. [9] Vol. iv. p. 306.

For

Digitized by Google

For it ſeems—" To DISSEMBLE was a " fundamental principle of apoſtolical con- " duct. PAUL practiſed it. We have his " own word for this; and he boaſts of " it [10]." His Lordſhip lets us know, that *Paul* had aſſurance enough to do any thing. For ſpeaking of the Apoſtle's famous argument *ad modeſtiam—Nay, but, O man, who art thou that replieſt againſt God?* &c. [11]. He ſays " There is ſomething " ſo IMPUDENT, as well as abſurd in this " proceeding, that, common as it is, one " can ſee no example of it without ſur- " priſe [12]."

" Can he be leſs than mad, ſays his " Lordſhip, who boaſts a revelation ſu- " per-added to reaſon, to ſupply the de- " fects of it, and who ſuper-adds rea- " ſon to revelation to ſupply the defects " of this too, at the ſame time? This is " madneſs or there is no ſuch thing inci- " dent to our nature. And into this kind " of madneſs, ST. PAUL, profound in ca- " baliſtical learning, hath fallen [13]." And yet, as mad as it is, all States and Societies have matched it, when they *ſuper-*

[10] Vol. iv. p. 306—7. [11] Rom. ix. 20.
[12] Vol. iii. p. 307. [13] Vol. iv. p. 172.

added

Digitized by Google

added civil Laws, to natural conſcience or Religion, *to ſupply the defects of it*; *and ſuperadded* natural conſcience or Religion to Civil Laws, *to ſupply the defects of thoſe too, at the ſame time.* But more of this in it's place.

" St. PAUL carried into the Apoſtle-
" ſhip a great deal of that ASSUMING
" AIR, which is apt to accompany much
" learning, *or the opinion of it*—a great
" profuſion of words, and of involved
" and unconnected diſcourſe, even on
" thoſe ſubjects which required to be moſt
" clearly and diſtinctly developed. — He
" was a *looſe paraphraſer, a Cabaliſtical*
" *Commentator*, as much, *at leaſt*, as any
" ancient or modern Rabbin [14]." " St.
" PAUL's ſyſtem of Religion, is an *intri-*
" *cate and dark Syſtem, with, here and*
" *there, an intelligible phraſe, that caſts no*
" *light on the reſt, but is rather loſt in the*
" *gloom of the whole* [15]."---" Having ſaid
" ſo much of the *intelligibility of Paul's*
" *Goſpel*, TRUTH authoriſes me to add,
" that where it is intelligible, it is of-
" ten ABSURD, or PROPHANE, or TRI-

[14] Vol. iv. p. 326—7. [15] Vol. iv. p. 328.

" FLING."

Digitized by Google

" FLING [16]."—" PAUL taught *predeſti-*
" *nation* and UNLIMITED PASSIVE OBEDI-
" ENCE: the one abſurd, the other both
" abſurd and IMPIOUS [17]."

Was it poſſible to laugh, in the midſt of theſe horrors, what mortal could now forbear. *Unlimited paſſive obedience*, quoth he! The noble Lord had been ſo long accuſtomed to the cant of his Faction, which made St. Paul the preacher of I cannot tell what nonſenſe under that name, that he ſeems now in good earneſt to believe he was ſo. A juſt judgment on the Politician; to come at laſt, to give credit to his own Flams. However, in this inſtance, at leaſt, one would hope St. Paul might have been ſpared, if it were only for old-acquaintance-ſake; and the hard ſervice they had put the LEATHER-DRESSING PONTIFF upon. But it is bad truſting, we ſee, to the gratitude of Stateſmen. Happy for us, PAUL has yet an able Defender; who will never be wanting in what he owes to gratitude and honour. I beg leave to ſay thus much, becauſe as *Clarke* and *Wollaſton* found the worſe treatment for being the favourite

[16] Id. ib. [17] Vol. iv. p. 510.

Philo-

Digitized by Google

Philoſophers of Q. C. (as is well known to thoſe who were in the ſecret either of his paſſions or his party) ſo St. *Paul*, I am perſuaded, did not fare the better for being patronized by his Lordſhip's illuſtrious Friend.

"CHRISTIANITY (ſays his Lordſhip) "became FANATICISM in the FIRST pro- "feſſors of it. Men corrupted it by AR- "TIFICIAL THEOLOGY. And ſome will "be apt to think, that the firſt of theſe "men was PAUL — Divines will be FU- "RIOUS to hear SUCH LANGUAGE [18]." Alas! No. He miſtakes the mood, in which his works chanced to find them. They laugh at his vanity; and pity the FURY that inſpired SUCH LANGUAGE. And he gives them ample exerciſe for all their pity: for having done with PAUL, he turns now to rail with the ſame virulence againſt CHRIST himſelf.

"The truth is, CHRISTIANITY pre- "ſerved, in many reſpects, a ſtrong tang of "the ſpirit of Judaiſm. The ſupreme Be- "ing took a milder appearance; his fa- "vour was confined no longer to one peo- "ple. The MESSIAH came and redeemed

[18] Vol. v. p. 275.

"fallen

Digitized by Google

" fallen Man. CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY " discovers in this myſterious proceeding " the love of God to Man; his infinite " juſtice and goodneſs. BUT REASON " will diſcover the fantaſtical, confuſed " and inconſiſtent notions of Jewiſh Theo- " logy, latent in it; and applied to ano- " ther ſyſtem of Religion. *This love will* " *appear partiality*; *this juſtice will appear* " *injuſtice*; *this goodneſs will appear cruelty.* " On the whole, the moral character im- " puted to the ſupreme Being by Chriſtian " Theology differs little from that imputed " to him by the Jewiſh. The difference is " rather apparent than real [19]." " The " ſcene of Chriſtianity has been ALWAYS a " ſcene of diſſention, of hatred, of perſe- " cution, and of BLOOD [20]."

Speaking of CHRIST's *Sermon on the Mount*, his Lordſhip ſays, — " Some [of " the precepts] are directed to the *Jews* " only, and ſome more immediately to " the Diſciples of Chriſt. The ſecond " ſort ſeem fit enough for a *religious Sect*; " but are by no means practicable in the " general Society of Mankind. *Conſidered* " *as general duties they are impracticable,*

[19] Vol. v. p. 532. [20] Vol. iv. p. 511.

Digitized by Google

" *inconſiſtent with* NATURAL INSTINCT,
" *as well as* LAW, *and* QUITE DESTRUC-
" TIVE OF SOCIETY [1]."

" The CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY has de-
" rived from the *Jewiſh*, a prophane li-
" cence, which *makes men blaſpheme without*
" *knowing they blaſpheme, and makes their*
" *very devotion impious* [2]."

" I would ſooner be reputed, nay I would
" ſooner be a Pagan, than a Chriſtian, or an
" Atheiſt than a Theiſt, if to be one or
" the other it was neceſſary to believe ſuch
" ABSURDITIES as theſe; which, however
" diſguiſed and ſoftened by a *certain cant*
" *of expreſſion*, are directly PROPHANE;
" and indirectly, or by conſequence at leaſt,
" *blaſphemous* [3]."

" ALL THE BEDLAMS OF THE WORLD
" cannot match the abſurdities that have
" been propagated by Chriſtians, whether
" heretics or orthodox, concerning the
" *making and governing of the world by the*
" *miniſtration of inferior Beings:* Beings
" not eternal, but produced in time by *ema-*
" *nation, or ſome other inconceivable manner*
" *of generation* [4]."

[1] Vol. iv. p. 299, 300.
[2] Vol. v. p. 519.
[3] Vol. iv. p. 34.
[4] Vol. iv. p. 22.

" We

Digitized by Google

"We cannot believe the SCRIRTURES "to be God's *word*, tho' we know the "phyſical and moral Syſtem are his *Work*, "while we find in them ſuch repugnancies "to the Nature of an all-perfect Being; "not myſteries, but abſurdities; not things "incomprehenſible, but things that imply "manifeſtly contradiction with his Na- "ture [5]."

In a word, he tells us, that "THE RE- "LIGION OF NATURE HAS BEEN TURNED "ALMOST INTO BLASPHEMY BY REVE- "LATION [6]." "To believe (ſays he) "that *Jeſus was the Meſſiah* is ſaid by "ſome [meaning his *Maſter Locke*] to "be the *unum neceſſarium* of FAITH, "but TO OBSBRVE THE LAW OF NATURE "IS THE UNUM NECESSARIUM OF DU- "TY [7]."

But now having expoſed MOSES, CHRIST, and PAUL; decried the falſhood of the TWO REVELATIONS; and ridiculed the abſurdity of ſacred SCRIPTURE; he ſhews us, in mere charity, after the example of the WISE ALPHONSUS, how either ſyſtem might have been mended, had his

[5] Vol. iii. p. 306, 7. [6] Vol. iii. p. 498.
[7] Vol. iv. p. 410.

Digitized by Google

Lordſhip been conſulted; while, like the WISE ALPHONSUS, he believes juſt as much of God's *Word*, as the Other did of his *Works*.

Firſt, he hints, how the LAW might have been better planned. "God pur-
"chaſed the obedience of the *Jewiſh* Peo-
"ple by a mercenary bargain. It was
"ill kept on their part. And the Law,
"with all it's ſanctions, was continually
"violated; ſometimes rejected; and had,
"in no degree, a force ſufficient to main-
"tain itſelf in obſervation and reverence.
"Now, one of the moſt conceivable per-
"fections of a Law is, that it be made with
"ſuch a foreſight of all poſſible accidents,
"and with ſuch proviſions for the due exe-
"cution of it, in all caſes, that the *Law*
"may be effectual to govern and direct
"theſe accidents, inſtead of lying at the
"mercy of them. — Another the moſt
"conceivable perfection of a *Law* conſiſts
"in the clearneſs and preciſion of its terms.
"— Theſe will be found, no doubt, and
"ought to be expected, when God is the
"Legiſlator [8]."

[8] Vol. iii. p. 292,3.

He

Digitized by Google

He next ſhews us, how he could have improved the GOSPEL, had he been of God's privy-counſel. "Had the doctrine "of future rewards and puniſhments been "taught by CHRISTIANITY in terms "*more general and leſs deſcriptive*; had "the puniſhments been repreſented, for "inſtance, like the rewards, to be, ſim-"ply, ſuch *as eye never ſaw, nor ear* "*heard, nor the heart of man could conceive*, "it might have been maintained in credit, "and had an univerſal and real influence "perhaps, to the great advantage of reli-"gion [9]."

An inattentive Reader may be ſurprized, perhaps, at this wantonneſs of his Lord-ſhip's pen; that when he had given it as his fixed opinion, that all which the World hath hitherto called *Religion*, is a public miſchief; and that a *future State* is an abſurd fable; he ſhould, with great formality, deliver in a plan which would have given *credit* and *real efficacy* to non-ſenſe and impiety. But we muſt conſider, He had been ſo long playing the PHILOSOPHER, that he had reaſon to apprehend we might forget the other part of his ſub-

[9] Vol. v. p. 542.

Digitized by Google

lime Character, the LEGISLATOR. He therefore deemed it expedient to give us a ſlight caſt of his office, in rectifying the blunders of MOSES and JESUS CHRIST.

With regard to MOSES and his *Law*, I have ſo much to ſay to his Lordſhip, that I ſhall reſerve it for an after-reckoning. The other is but a ſmall matter, and may be ſettled here.

I ſuſpect then, our *Legiſlator* in this remark concerning Jeſus's manner of revealing a *future ſtate*, did not ſufficiently attend to the nature of the human mind, nor to the genius of the Goſpel. He would have, we ſee, the account of *future puniſhments as general*, and *as little deſcriptive*, as that of *future rewards*. He ſeems to think the latter managed well: But this propriety, he meaſures from the imaginary impropriety of the other: he appears to have no idea of any excellency it has in itſelf. We ſhall endeavour therefore to explain *why* this method of repreſenting *future rewards* was right: By which it will appear, that the other, of repreſenting *future puniſhments*, was not wrong.

To grow *particular* and *deſcriptive*, whether of future rewards, or future puniſh-

Digitized by Google

puniſhments, men muſt borrow their images from *material and corporeal* things; becauſe they have no faculties of ſenſation proper to comprehend ideas taken from things *Spiritual.* Now when a follower of Chriſt is ſo far advanced as to have his Faith work by *hope,* his ſentiments grow refined, his ideas purify, and he is riſing apace towards that perfection which the Goſpel encourages him to aſpire after. But while *fear of puniſhment* chiefly operates upon him, he is yet in the loweſt ſtage of probation; his imagination is groſs, and his appetites ſenſual. Is it not evident, then, that a *deſcriptive* Heaven of delights would be ill ſuited to that purity and elevation of mind, ſolely fixed by *hope,* on happineſs; and as evident that a *general undefined* denunciation of Hell would not have force enough to make the neceſſary impreſſion on a ſenſual fancy agitated by *fear?* Let not his Lordſhip's admirers, therefore, be offended, if we believe that, in this point, the Author of our Salvation went at leaſt one ſtep beyond their Maſter, in *true Politics.*

To proceed. From vilifying BOTH RELIGIONS, and their FOUNDERS, his Lord-

Digitized by Google

ſhip comes, at length, to rail againſt the GOD of *both Religions*. And with this I ſhall cloſe the horrid Scene.

"IF WE BELIEVE IN MOSES, AND HIS "GOD, WE CANNOT BELIEVE IN THAT "GOD WHOM OUR REASON SHEWS US [10].

"CAN ANY MAN PRESUME TO SAY "THAT THE GOD OF MOSES, OR THE "GOD OF PAUL, IS THE TRUE GOD? "The God of MOSES is partial, unjuſt, "and cruel; delights in blood, commands "aſſaſſinations, maſſacres, and even exter- "minations of people. The God of "PAUL elects ſome of his creatures to "ſalvation, and predeſtinates others to "deſtruction, even in the womb of their "mothers. And, indeed, if there was "not a Being INFINITELY MORE PER- "FECT than theſe, there would be no God "at all, nor any true Religion in the "world [11]."

Who, that had heard this dreadful language, without knowing from what quarter it came, but would ſtrait have called to mind the words of the Satyriſt?

[10] Vol. iii. p. 307. [11] Vol. v. p. 567.

"Not

"Not Danté, dreaming all th' infernal State,
"Beheld ſuch ſcenes of envy, ſin, and hate.

But when we underſtand them to be the ejaculations of this Noble Philoſopher, the Confeſſor of Truth, the Advocate of Virtue, and the Reſtorer of baniſhed Nature; employed, as he himſelf tells us, or rather *ſet apart*, TO PLEAD THE CAUSE OF GOD HIMSELF AGAINST DIVINES AND ATHEISTS IN CONFEDERACY [12]; when we conſider all this, I ſay, What are we to think, but that they are the pious breathings of an over-heated zeal: and tho' expreſſed in no conſecrated terms; indeed, ſuch as had been much worn in the ſervice of the CRAFTS-MAN; yet when new-ſet in his Lordſhip's immortal Panoply of the FIRST PHILOSOPHY, they may now prove as uſeful, to advance the *fear of God*, as before, to promote the *honour of the King*.

It is in HATE as in LOVE; hard to ſeparate the *carnal* from the *divine* ſpecies; or rather they are but different ebullitions of the ſame ſpecies. Hence it is, that the melting ſtrains of the *Myſtic*, the *Methodiſt*, and the *Moravian*, ſo often ſmell of the

[12] Vol. v. p. 305.

STEWS;

Digitized by Google

STEWS; and hence, by parity of reason, the thunder of his Lordship's eloquence may naturally re-echo, as it were, from BILLINSGATE.

But these things make You serious: and You ask, "Who, that hath ever heard Lord Bolingbroke's Story, would have suspected, that his GOD and his COUNTRY lay so near his heart? His *Political* and *Philosophic* Writings, say you, are full of *Lamentations*; where, like another Jeremy, he bewails the dishonours which wicked PRIESTS, and wicked POLITICIANS, have brought both upon Church and State: And, as is common in extreme fondness for our favourite Objects, he suffers himself to be alarmed with something less than panic terrors. He is afraid the *Whigs* will bring in the *Pretender*; and apprehends, the *english Clergy* have made large steps to introduce *Atheism*."

I know what You drive at. You would fain apply to his right honourable Person, the old trite aphorism, *That wicked principles spring out of a wicked life.* But what says another noble Peer to this? "Fain would "the Bigot, in consequence of his *moral* "*maxims*, and *political establishments*, con-

"found

Digitized by Google

" found *licentiouſneſs in morals* with *liberty* " *of thought* and action; and make the *li-* " *bertine*, who has the LEAST MASTERY " OF HIMSELF, reſemble his direct oppo- " ſite [13]."

It may be ſo, you will ſay. But Lord Bolingbroke ſurely could never object to the imputation which *bad morals* caſt upon a *Teacher of Truth*. He, who ſees it ſo clearly, and preſſes it ſo charitably, upon the whole body of the *Chriſtian Clergy*.

" How (ſays his Lordſhip) can the " CLERGY of your Church or of ours, " pretend that they contribute now, or E- " VER DID CONTRIBUTE, to the reforma- " tion of mankind? No age can be pointed " out, wherein ALL THE VICES, that Tully " imputes to moſt of the heathen Philoſo- " phers, did not prevail AMONGST MOST " of the Chriſtian Divines with great cir- " cumſtances of aggravation. They have " not only ALL THE VICES incident to " human nature in common with other " men, but they have had the peculiar " Vices of their Order. I WILL SAY " BOLDLY, they are, in general, much

[13] *Characteriſtics*, Vol. iii. Miſc. 5. Chap. 3.

fitter

Digitized by Google

"fitter to hinder, by their EXAMPLE, "than to promote by their DOCTRINE, the "Advancement of Religion, natural or "revealed."

We have, it is true, been favoured with very ample accounts of the immoral conduct both of antient Philoſophers and Modern Clergymen; and theſe, even by members of their own reſpective Bodies.

FREE-THINKERS have been more baſhful: and, by their reſerve and modeſty on this head, one might have taken them for Saints, had it not been for the *Confeſſions* of one of them, the famous CARDAN; who, like another St. *Auſtin*, ſeems ſworn to leave nothing behind him in the inkhorn. The account he gives of himſelf deſerves tranſcribing for more reaſons than one. —— "In diem viven-"tem, nugacem, religionis contempto-"rem, illatæ injuriæ memorem, invi-"dum, triſtem, inſidiatorem, proditorem, "ſuorum oſorem, turpi libidini dedi-"tum, ſolitarium, inamœnum, auſterum, "obſcœnum, laſcivum, maledicum, vari-"um, ancipitem, impurum, calumnia-"torem [14] *&c.*" This was fair deal-

[14] *De vita ſua.*

ing:

Digitized by Google

ing: and he who was ſo *free* with himſelf, might be pardoned if he ſpared no body elſe. But men don't uſe to be wanton on ſo nice a ſubject. *Freethinkers* have *more maſtery of themſelves*, ſays the noble Author of the *Characteriſtics*. And therefore whenever we ſee it done, let us conclude it to be for ſome great purpoſe; as, in emulation of the Chriſtian Confeſſors, who, to diſplay the powers of *Grace*, did not ſcruple to tell the world with great ſimplicity what they were by *Nature*; ſo Cardan to ſhew us, that the FIRST PHILOSOPHY is as efficacious in all great changes, has fairly told us how well befriended he had been by his *Stars*. However, let his deſign be what it will in preſenting us with this picture of his amiable turn of mind, we are much beholden to him for ſetting the example. Tho', like all other good examples, it may poſſibly end where it begun; and the *firſt Philoſophy* wait with patience for ſome leſs incommodious way of recommendation. And indeed, while Infidelity, which is the *cure*, is ſo unjuſtly ſuppoſed the *cauſe* of theſe Peccadillos, we need not wonder our Philoſophers ſhould be ſoon at liberty, and as ſoon diſpoſed, to

Digitized by Google

turn their view from their own morals, upon the morals of the Clergy: and *ſay boldly*, with his Lordſhip, that *the order in general is much fitter to hinder by their* EXAMPLE, *than to promote by their* DOCTRINE, *the advancement of Religion.*

What ſhall we ſay then? May it not be as well to leave the *examples*, of both, to ſhift for themſelves; and to conſider only their *Doctrines?* I think it is: And will therefore proceed from his Lordſhip's TEMPER, to his PRINCIPLES. But this muſt be the ſubject of another Letter.

I am, *&c.*

LET-

Digitized by Google

LETTER II.

IT has been obſerved, that rare and extraordinary bleſſings, whether civil or religious, ſeldom come till hope grows deſperate, and long expectation be quite wearied out. Then it is, the ſuperior Genius beſtirs himſelf, the criſis approaches, a *coup d'éclat* is ſtruck, and the admiring world is taken in by ſurpriſe.

The caſe before us is an illuſtrious inſtance. Never was mankind in ſo deplorable a way as when his Lordſhip arrived; from what other Syſtem is not yet diſcovered: tho' his tuneful Friend was very poſitive he belonged not to this: Inſomuch, that when the laſt Comet appeared, and came pretty near the Earth, he uſed to tell his acquaintance, he ſhould not be ſurprized if in the event it proved, that it was ſent only to convey his Lordſhip home again; juſt as a Stage-coach ſtops at your door to take up a Paſſenger. Be this as it will: bad indeed was our condition when his Lordſhip's arrived. — what ſhall I ſay, *to be a light to thoſe who ſat in darkneſs?* No, this is the work of meaner

Digitized by Google

meaner Miſſionaries; but, to RESTORE MANKIND TO THEIR SENSES.

For his Lordſhip, in his account of the general DELIRIUM which had ſeized the *Clergy*, had given us but a *ſpecimen* of the human condition: the MADNESS was indeed UNIVERSAL. Inſomuch, that (as he well expreſſes it) ALL THE BEDLAMS OF THE WORLD [1] were not ſufficient for theſe things. And, to confeſs the truth, when was it, that the viſions of an *over-heated and diſordered imagination*, ſuch as, belief in the *moral Attributes of God, the immortality of the Soul, a particular Providence, and a future State*, did not infect all times and places?

"ALL EUROPE (ſays his Lordſhip) GREW "DELIRIOUS [2]. Chriſtianity was left to "ſhift for itſelf in the midſt of a FRANTIC "WORLD [3]." And again, "OUR WORLD "ſeems to be, in many reſpects, THE BED-"LAM OF EVERY OTHER SYSTEM OF IN-"TELLIGENT CREATURES: and, with this "unlucky circumſtance, that they who are "*moſt mad* govern, in things of the greateſt "moment, them who are *leaſt ſo* [4]."

[1] Vol. iv. p. 72.
[2] Vol. iv. p. 377.
[3] Vol. iv. p. 353.
[4] Vol. iv. p. 316.

By

Digitized by Google

By what is here dropt in the concluſion, you underſtand why his Lordſhip choſe to make the Clergy lead up the *Brawls*; and the *Leather-dreſſing Pontiff* himſelf to preſide in this mad dance, as Maſter of the Revels.

But to find all mankind mad, is more, perhaps, than you expected. What then? Is the madneſs leſs real for being univerſal? His Lordſhip's *Logic* ſays otherwiſe. And his Lordſhip's *Logic*, I can aſſure you, is not like his Theology, of yeſterday; it comes of great Kindred. *Oliver Cromwell's* Porter had long ago enobled this very *Syllogiſm*. *I ſee plainly* (ſays this Sage) *that either I or all the world beſides are mad: but as it is not I, it muſt needs be they.* And he was then advancing with large ſtrides, as one may ſay, towards the *firſt Philoſophy*; being indeed, at that time, a kind of *Rector magnificus* in the Engliſh College of Bethlehem.

Was it then, you will aſk, ſome ſtrange and evil diſpoſition of the ſtars, that occaſioned this univerſal inſanity? So, indeed, it is reported [5]. The WORLD, it ſeems, like the men of *Abdera* [6], had ſeen a

[5] Vid. *D. N. J. C. geneſeos themâ*, inter Cardani Op. [6] *See Lucian's true hiſtory.*

Digitized by Google

Tragedy repreſented to them in a very hot day: the ſubject of which left ſo ſtrong an impreſſion on their fancies, that they all thought themſelves concerned in the cataſtrophe. Some ran about from country to country, to tell their ſtory; and the reſt have been ever ſince rehearſing and celebrating thoſe affecting ſcenes, at home; till LORD BOLINGBROKE, like another HIPPOCRATES, came to their relief: and having firſt well phyſicked them of their Faith and their Viſions, brought them to themſelves, by applying to their hurt imaginations, the ſovereign Reſtorative of his FIRST PHILOSOPHY. Of which, I am now, as I promiſed, to give you ſome account.

But to ſee this extraordinary man in a juſt light, it will be proper to ſhew what *Man* was before him. A RELIGIOUS ANIMAL he is on all hands allowed to be. And till the coming of this FIRST PHILOSOPHY, *Religion* was ever underſtood to riſe on that wide baſis, on which PAUL, tho' a *fanatical Knave*, had the *art* to place it; that "He who cometh to God muſt believe "that he IS: and that he is a REWARDER "of them who diligently ſeek him [7]."

[7] Heb. xi. 6.

For

Digitized by Google

For till the arrival of his Lordſhip, men who ſuppoſed the infinite *goodneſs and juſtice* of God to be as demonſtrable as his infinite *power and wiſdom*, could not but conclude from his *moral attributes*, that he REWARDED, as well as from his *natural attributes*, that he CREATED.

On the more complex notion, therefore, of a MORAL GOVERNOR, all mankind ſuppoſed RELIGION to ariſe; and NATURALISM, the Ape of Religion, from the ſimpler notion of a PHYSICAL PRESERVER: which, however, they were ready to diſtinguiſh, on the other hand, from the *Unnaturaliſm* (if we may ſo term it) of *ranker Atheiſm*.

RELIGION, therefore, ſtands, and muſt, I think, for ever ſtand, on thoſe two immoveable principles of PRESERVER and REWARDER, in conjunction.

The *length* or *ſhortneſs* of human exiſtence was not primarily in the idea of Religion, not even in the complete idea of it, as delivered in ST. PAUL's general definition. " The Religioniſt, ſays he, muſt be- " lieve that God *is*, and that he *rewards*."

But when it came to be ſeen, that he was not always a *Rewarder* here, men con-

Digitized by Google

cluded this life not to be the whole of their exiſtence. And thus a FUTURE STATE was brought into Religion; and from thenceforth became a neceſſary part of it.

To explain my meaning, if ſo clear a thing needs explanation. GOD, under the *phyſical* idea of *Preſerver* and Creator appears uniform, regular, and inſtant to his *Creatures:* Under the *moral* idea of *Rewarder* and Governor, he ſeems frequently to be withdrawn from his *Servants.* For tho' in the moral diſpenſations of things here, good and evil be often proportioned to deſert; yet often, too, they are not ſo exactly adjuſted. The Antient Religioniſt, therefore, confiding in his demonſtration of the *moral* as well as the *natural* attributes of the Deity, concluded, That the *preſent* was not the only ſtate ordained for man; but that in ſome other life, theſe irregularities would be ſet right. Hence a FUTURE STATE became in all ages and countries (except one, where the moral adminiſtration of providence was different) inſeparable from, and eſſential to, the various Religions of mankind. Even the mere Vulgar, who did not reach the force of this demonſtration, yet ſeeing the marks

Digitized by Google

marks of moral Government, amidſt the frequent interruptions of it, embraced the doctrine of a *future State*, with the ſame confidence as the Learned. For plain Nature had inſtructed them to reaſon thus, — If all were *regular*, nothing needed to be ſet right: and if all were *irregular*, there was no one to ſet things right.

Such was the ANTIENT RELIGION OF NATURE: To which, modern Divines have generally agreed to give the name of THEISM, when profeſſed by thoſe who never heard of REVELATION; and the name of DEISM, when profeſſed by thoſe who would never give credit to it.

In this State our noble Philoſopher found the *religious World*; or, more properly, this was the language he heard reſounding from one end of the earth to the other: But it was a language, he tells us, he did not underſtand. It was to his ears, *like the choirs of birds, who whiſtle and ſing, or ſcream, at one another: or the herds of beaſts, who bleat and low, or chatter and roar, at one another.* He rejects it, therefore in the lump, as one inarticulate din of ENTHUSIASM and ABSURDITY; the product of *pride* and *ignorance*; and, with

Digitized by Google

greater of his own, erects the FIRST PHILOSOPHY on it's ruins.

He permits us to believe, that an intelligent Cauſe made the world; and governs it, by his *phyſical* and *general* Laws; not by *moral* or *particular*.

He bids us to underſtand, that this World was no more made for man than for every animal beſides: nor was man made for any other world, nor conſequently, (as Divines have dreamt) for happineſs.

That, by the *arbitrary conſtitution* of things in the human ſyſtem (which may have a contrary diſpoſition in other ſyſtems) Virtue promotes happineſs and Vice brings on miſery.

That THIS CONSTITUTION, together with the coactivity of CIVIL LAWS, contain all the rewards and puniſhments attendant on Virtue and on Vice.

That prayer, ſupplication, and every other office of Religion in uſe amongſt men, to implore good, and to deprecate evil, are fooliſh and fanatical: for that all religious duty is comprized in *ſubmiſſion to the eſtabliſhed order of things*.

He ſums up his ſyſtem in theſe words. "A ſelf-exiſtent being the firſt cauſe of all "things,

Digitized by Google

" things, infinitely POWERFUL and infi-
" nitely WISE, is the God of natural Theo-
" logy. And the whole ſyſtem of natural
" Religion reſts on it, and requires NO
" BROADER FOUNDATION [8]." That is, it is enough for *him who cometh* to this new Religion, *to believe that God* IS; and not that he is a REWARDER *of them who ſeek him.* And again, " When men have pro-
" ved the exiſtence of an all-perfect being,
" the Creator and Governor of the Uni-
" verſe, and demonſtrated his infinite POW-
" ER and WISDOM, from his works, when
" they have done this, THEY HAVE DONE
" ALL; *this includes the whole of natural*
" *Theology, and ſerves abundantly to all the*
" *ends of natural Religion* [9]."

What theſe *ends of natural Religion* are he tells us very plainly. They are, to fit us for *our ſtation here, and to ſupply our real wants in it.* --- " In like manner [that is, as he expreſſes it, *for the neceſſary uſes of human life and no more*] " the know-
" ledge of the creator is on many accounts
" neceſſary to ſuch a creature as man: and
" therefore we are able to arrive, by a pro-
" per exerciſe of our mental faculties, from

[8] Vol. v. p. 316. [9] p. 453.

Digitized by Google

" the knowledge of God's works, to a " knowledge of his EXISTENCE, and of " that infinite POWER and WISDOM which " are demonſtrated to us in them. OUR " KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING GOD GOES " NO FURTHER [10]."

Now tho' we ſhould be ſo complaiſant to theſe *principles* as not to call them ATHEISTIC, yet I am afraid the Profeſſor of them, whoever he be, muſt be content with a name ſomething like it. For tho' the *principles* may be called NATURALISM, yet if *Scripture* has defined an ATHEIST right, to be one who HAS NO HOPE, and is WITHOUT GOD IN THE WORLD [11] our Profeſſor of Naturaliſm comes within the deſcription. For tho' he acknowledges the being of a God, yet as he is *without a God in the world*, that is, a Being who preſides over it, as the moral Governor of it, which is the foundation on which all Religion ſtands, Religioniſts will ſeek no other title for him. And ſurely he will be properly defined. For tho' the abſtract term *Atheiſm* carries, as it's principal idea, a relation to God's BEING: yet, *Atheiſt*, the concrete, ſeems to have it's

[10] Vol. iv. p. 86. [11] Epheſ. ii. 12.

chief

Digitized by Google

chief relation to his GOVERNMENT. This is not obſerved for any kind of conſequence it is to Religion, in what claſs the Public will be pleaſed to rank his Lordſhip; but merely to ſet in a true light the honourable Perſon's ingenuity, in aſſuming the character of an *Advocate for Religion*; at the very time he is labouring to root it out of human Society.

Old NATURALISM thus traveſtied under the name of *Religion*, his Lordſhip beſtows, as his laſt and moſt precious Legacy, on his own dear Country. If you will believe him, the only *reformed Religion* that can be called *pure*, and the only *revealed Religion* that has the marks of *truth*. What the world hath hitherto called by that name being, as he aſſures us, an evil in itſelf; and miſchievous to man by it's eſſential conſtitution. And he proves it, as they ſay, in mood and figure. — "To keep up the "ſenſe of it [*i. e.* of *Religion*] in the "minds of men, there ſeem to be but two "ways. To STRIKE THE SENSES fre-"quently, by public and ſolemn acts of "religious worſhip; and to HEAT THE "BRAIN by notions of an inward operation "of the Spirit, and of a ſort of myſtical "devo-

Digitized by Google

" devotion, independent of outward forms,
" and even INCONSISTENT with them. One
" of theſe leads to SUPERSTITION, the other
" to ENTHUSIASM. Both are ſilly.—Super-
" ſtition is folly: Enthuſiaſm is madneſs.
" It is good to be on our guard againſt
" both."

Without doubt. But how ſhall it be done? *Religion* is an evil in itſelf, and ſo admits of no qualification. It neceſſarily requires, as his Lordſhip tells us, on man's part, public acts of worſhip; and on God's, the private operation of the Spirit: But theſe *lead* to *ſuperſtition* and *enthuſiaſm*; that is, to *folly* and *madneſs*, to the deſtruction of our reaſonable Nature. This is not all: theſe *neceſſary means* are not only hurtful but impracticable. You could not uſe them, was you fooliſh or mad enough to venture on them; for they are, he ſays, INCONSISTENT, and deſtroy one another. What then is to be done? To *be upon our guard*; to keep *Religion* at arms length, till his Lordſhip brings up his reſerve of *Naturaliſm*, to our relief. Let this be our Shield of Braſs; under which we may repoſe in peace, undiſturbed by any frightful dreams of Hell and the Devil.

This,

Digitized by Google

This, Sir, is the *Enchiridion* of his Lordſhip's FIRST PHILOSOPHY. How ſimple, you will ſay, how cloſe, how round, how full is this *new Diſpenſation?* A diſpenſation *of Religion* ſhall we call it? No matter. The times are ripe for it under any name. Yet I can hardly agree to thoſe fancies, I told you of, which had poſſeſſed his poetical Friend: who, miſled perhaps by that obſcure hint, that *our World was only the Bedlam of every other ſyſtem of intelligent Creatures* [12], ſuppoſed, in good earneſt, his *Philoſopher and Guide* to be ſent down from ſome ſuperior orb, as Phyſician to the Hoſpital. Without queſtion he was made for the Age, and the Age for him. And they may well congratulate one another on the happy meeting. If we muſt be doctrinated by a Poet, I ſhould ſooner a great deal believe the man who told me, that he heard the evil Genius of Britain addreſs his Lordſhip on his firſt ſetting out, in theſe ſtrains,

— "Be as a planetary plague, when Jove
"Will o'er ſome high-vic'd City hang his poiſon
"In the ſick air." —

[12] Vol. iv. p. 353.

But

But to go on with his Syſtem. It riſes on theſe four principles.

Firſt, That we have no adequate ideas of the MORAL ATTRIBUTES of God, his *goodneſs* and his *juſtice*, as we have of his NATURAL, to wit, his *power* and his *wiſdom*.

Secondly, That A FUTURE STATE is a Fable.

Thirdly, That the JEWISH and the CHRISTIAN *Revelations* are falſe. And

Fourthly, That REVELATION ITSELF is impoſſible.

Indulge me with a few remarks on his management, under each of theſe heads.

1. Divines, in their proof of the *moral attributes*, having of late much inſiſted on the arguments *a priori*, as they are called, his Lordſhip ſuſpected, and what he ſuſpects of ill he always takes for granted, that they could not be proved *a poſteriori*, or from *God's works*; the way by which, he owns, his *natural attributes* may be demonſtrated. So that having pronounced the arguments *a priori* to be *jargon*, *nonſenſe*, *impiety and blaſphemy*; the *moral* attributes of God are fairly eraſed at once out of the *intellectual ſyſtem*. And he had no farther trouble on this head than to decorate CLARKE, who was chiefly converſant

Digitized by Google

converſant in the reaſoning *a priori*, with variety of abuſive names.

As to the Argument, our great Man's reſpect for that is ſo profound and ſo diſtant, that I defy any one unacquainted with metaphyſical reaſonings, even to gueſs what kind of things they are for which the famous Miniſter of St. *James's* is ſo ſeverely handled. For while the *Divine* ſuffers, the *Reaſoner*, as we ſay, always eſcapes. Now indeed you ſee him ſeized upon, and ready, as you would think, to be cut up alive, and immolated to the *firſt Philoſophy*; when a *fit of railing* ſhakes his Lordſhip; and the Storm falls upon the whole Body of *modern Schoolmen:* And ſo the Doctor eſcapes for that time. He is again laid hold on, and every thing ready for execution; when a *fit of learning* comes upon his Lordſhip; and *Pythagoras*, *Plato*, *Socrates*, and the whole band of *ancient Metaphyſicians* paſs in review, and each receives a laſh as he paſſes: And ſo the Doctor eſcapes for the ſecond time. After this, his Lordſhip, as is fitting, takes his eaſe; more intent upon triumph than blood-ſhed; and in the midſt of much ſelf-applauſe for

Digitized by Google

for theſe exploits his ESSAYS end, and the *ſubtile* Doctor remains unhurt.

But when need requires, I would have you think, that no avocation can keep him from his Logic. Marry, then, on ſome great occaſion indeed, as when the *novelty* of the ſubject invites, or the true ſtate of it is little known, you ſhall have no reaſon to complain of brevity: then you ſhall ſee him employ one half of his book to prove the corruptions of the CHURCH OF ROME, and near another half, to expoſe the jargon of the SCHOOLMEN.

The truth is, Clarke knew not how to reaſon, and ſo needed no confutation. *In the name of God* (ſays my Lord, of the Doctor's reaſonings) *is this to prove? Do men who prove no better deſerve an anſwer* [13]? But, go further, and you may fare worſe. For ſpeaking of the whole Order, he ſays, "THE PERTNESS, NOT TO SAY THE IM-"PUDENCE, OF THESE MEN DESERVES NO "REGARD [14]." Beſides, I ſuſpect the *arguments* are as IMPUDENT as the *men*, for they pretend to no leſs than to *demonſtrate* God's *moral attributes* and the *immateriality of the Soul.* His Lordſhip therefore

[13] Vol. v. p. 284. [14] Vol. iv. p. 325.

choſe

choſe that his *modeſt* reaſonings, rather than be overborn, ſhould lye incog. and keep in diſguiſe, like *Bays's* army in the *Rehearſal*; till, without noiſe, or ſo much as a review, they had dethroned the *two Kings of Brentford*, CLARKE and WOLLASTON, before any body ſuſpected they were in danger.

2. We come to the ſecond point, the doctrine of a FUTURE STATE: which being ſupported by the great moral argument of "the unequal diſtribution of good and evil amongſt men," his Lordſhip, as I promiſed you, is as large in confuting this as he was ſparing in his anſwer to the metaphyſical proofs of the *moral attributes*.

He firſt endeavours to ſhew the argument to be founded on a miſtaken fact, and that there is no ſuch *unequal* diſtribution: He is almoſt tempted to tell you, that every thing is exactly regular and in order. But a paradox that flies ſo *impudently*, to uſe his own language, in the face of common ſenſe, is too unmanagable even for his Lordſhip's talents: he comes down lower at laſt; and appears to be tolerably ſatisfied, if you will but believe the inequality not near ſo great as *pulpit-Declaim-*

Digitized by Google

ers would make it: That the diſorders which follow the abuſe of man's free will are not to be placed to the account of that diſpenſation; which our pride and preſumptuous ignorance make us think God is obliged to reform. However, equal or unequal, his capital maxim clears up all. WHATSOEVER IS, IS RIGHT: and therefore the argument of theſe *confederated* Divines which goes upon a ſuppoſed WRONG, is *abſurd and blaſphemous*. Whatever *anſwer* this reaſoning may deſerve, I believe no man who underſtands the world will expect that a well-bred man ſhould give any.

But I cannot omit, on this occaſion, to do juſtice to his poetical Friend; by ſhewing the difference between Mr. POPE's Philoſophy and his Lordſhip's. They both employ the maxim of *Whatever is, is right*. But to know, with what propriety and judgment, we muſt conſider againſt whom they write.

Mr. Pope's *Eſſay on man* is a *real* vindication of Providence againſt *Libertines* and *Atheiſts*; who quarrel with the preſent conſtitution of things, and deny a future State. To theſe he anſwers that *whatever is, is right*: and the reaſon he gives, is, that *we*

ſee

Digitized by Google

ſee only a part of the moral ſyſtem, and not the whole; therefore theſe irregularities ſerving to great purpoſes, ſuch as the fuller manifeſtation of God's goodneſs and juſtice, they are *right*.

Lord Bolingbroke's *Eſſays* are a *pretended* vindication of Providence againſt an *imaginary confederacy between Divines and Atheiſts*; who uſe a common principle, namely, the *inequalities in God's moral government here*, for different ends and purpoſes; the One to eſtabliſh a *future State*; the Other to diſcredit the *Being of a God*. His Lordſhip, who oppoſes their different concluſions, endeavours to overthrow their common principle, by his Friend's maxim, that *whatever is, is right*; not becauſe the preſent ſtate of our *moral* world (which is part only of a more general ſyſtem) is neceſſary for the greater perfection of the whole, but becauſe our *moral world* is an entire ſyſtem of itſelf.

His Lordſhip *applies* the maxim no better than he underſtands it. Mr. Pope urges it againſt Atheiſts and Libertines, who ſay the conſtitution of things is *faulty*: ſo that the reply, *whatever is, is right*, is pertinent. His Lordſhip directs it, againſt

Digitized by Google

Divines, who ſay, indeed, that this conſtitution is *imperfect*, if conſidered ſeparately, becauſe it is a part only of a whole, but are as far as his Lordſhip from calling it *faulty*: therefore the reply, *whatever is, is right*, is impertinent. In a word, the Poet directs it againſt Atheiſts and Libertines, in ſupport of Religion properly ſo called; the Philoſopher againſt Divines, in ſupport of Religion improperly ſo called, namely NATURALISM: and the ſucceſs is anſwerable. Mr. Pope's argument is manly, ſyſtematical, and convincing. Lord Bolingbroke's confuſed, prevaricating, and inconſiſtent.

Thus, to inſtance in his Lordſhip. He will have nothing irregular or amiſs in the *moral world*; becauſe this is Atheiſm, and the very bond of that *confederacy* ſigned and ſealed between Divines and them. In vain you tell him of a *future ſtate*, to vindicate the providence of God; this is abſurd and viſionary. But, if you talk of *phyſical evil*, he has his anſwer ready, *this world is but one wheel of a vaſt machine*. You will aſk, then, if the ſuperior good of other parts of the great ſyſtem of Nature can compenſate for the *phyſical evil* in this, why will not his Lordſhip allow the reaſoning

Digitized by Google

of Pope, in the *Eſſay on man*, that the ſuperior good in another part of the *moral ſyſtem* may compenſate for the *moral evil* in this? I will tell you, he can allow any other parts to belong to the ſyſtem of nature, for the ſolution of *phyſical evil*, without the danger of bringing in Religion: but he cannot, without that danger, allow any other part to belong to the ſyſtem of morals, for the ſolution of *moral* evil. Here, he can allow no more to belong to the ſyſtem than he ſees: indeed, not ſo much: for, as I ſaid above, he appears well inclined to contend for an *equal providence*, or, at leaſt, for very little irregularity.

But why, you will aſk again, would his Lordſhip run himſelf into all this hazard, ſometimes of diſcrediting his reaſoning by a ſilly paradox; ſometimes of betraying it by an unwilling confeſſion; while at beſt he gives it but the poor ſupport of a miſunderſtood and miſapplied maxim; when his great and noble principle of NO MORAL ATTRIBUTES enervates the very *fact*, ſo audaciouſly urged by the CONFEDERACY. For if we have no ideas of God's *moral attributes*, the iſſue of our reaſoning *on*

Digitized by Google

his ways will be the ſame as if he had none. And if he has none, they need not, ſure, be vindicated: which is the ſole purpoſe of his reaſoning on the ſtate of the moral world. All I can ſay to this is, that his Lordſhip appears to have been ſo harraſſed with this phantom of a FUTURE STATE, that no Charm, no Security was to be neglected that could contribute to his eaſe or protection. Hence it is he will depend on neither of his arguments, of — *no inequality* or — *but a little*: and is as ſhy of them, as they are of one another; and therefore, to make all ſure, caſts about for a third of more acknowledged efficacy.

And this he finds in the SOUL's MATERIALITY. From whence, he contrives to perſuade himſelf that it can be no *ſubſtance* (which he calls *pneumatical madneſs*) but a mere *quality* of body, produced by the configuration of it's parts, and periſhing with their diſſolution. I ſay, he contrives to perſuade *himſelf*; and I mean no more. Had his point been to perſuade his Reader, we muſt ſuppoſe he would have ventured, at leaſt, to confute the arguments of CLARKE and BAXTER:

Digitized by Google

who, on the principles of the Newtonian Philoſophy, have demonſtrated *that the ſoul is a ſubſtance*, diſtinct from the body, and different from matter. Inſtead of this, he flies to his uſual conſolation, ABUSE. He calls them *impious* and *blaſphemers* for preſuming to limit the omnipotent: when the higheſt of their preſumption amounts but to this, the ſuppoſing *God can exert no power, which implies a contradiction*; ſince this imaginary power is indeed *impotency*. Nay, he would willingly perſuade himſelf there were no ſuch arguments in being. For, ſpeaking of the reaſoning, which induced men to conclude, the ſoul was a ſubſtance, diſtinct from the body, he repreſents it thus, "Men taking it for granted that "they knew all the perceivable properties "of matter, they concluded that ſuch "things as could not be accounted for by "theſe, were to be accounted for by the "properties of ſome other ſubſtance [13]." And again, "Vanity and preſumption de-"termine Philoſophers to conclude, that "becauſe they cannot account for the phæ-"nomena of the mind by what they know

[13] Vol. iii. p. 502.

Digitized by Google

" very ſuperficially of ſolid extended ſub-
" ſtance, this mind muſt be ſome other ſub-
" ſtance [14]." Such, indeed, was the ſtate of the controverſy when LOCKE ſkimed over the argument. But CLARKE and BAXTER went to the bottom. They draw their concluſion, not in the preſumption that they knew all the knowable qualities of matter, and that between theſe and *Thought*, there was no perceivable connexion; but from this deep and ſolid truth, that from the little we do know of body, there ariſes a contradiction to ſuppoſe *intelligence* to be a quality of matter.

We have the ſame reaſoning on the *motion of body*. " They are unable (ſays
" his Lordſhip) to conceive how body can
" act at all, and therefore they ſuppoſe
" the immediate preſence and action of
" an incorporeal agent in every operation
" of corporeal nature [15]." Whereas the truth is, they are able to conceive the impoſſibility of bodies acting at all: and, from thence ſee the neceſſity of an *incorporeal agent in every operation of corporeal nature*. You will think, perhaps, his Lord-

[14] Vol. iii. p. 508-9. [15] Vol. iv. p. 108.

ſhip

ſhip knew no more of this queſtion than as it ſtood in his *Maſter Locke*; and that he had never heard of *Baxter*, who has carried it furtheſt, and treated it the moſt profoundly. I ſhould have thought ſo too, but that I find his Lordſhip, in one place, ſpeaking with that contempt of *Baxter's* reaſoning which is his wont, whenever any thing he cannot anſwer bears hard upon the *firſt Philoſophy*. It is where he honours us with his own thoughts concerning ATTRACTION. "Attraction, (ſaith his "Lordſhip) may be, notwithſtanding all "the *ſilly abſtract reaſoning* to the contrary, "a REAL PROPERTY OF MATTER [16]." Now you are to underſtand that *Baxter*, when he has evinced the truth of NEWTON's idea of *attraction* (who makes it no *real*, or eſſential, *property of matter*) employs this idea to prove, that it implies a *contradiction* to ſuppoſe the ſoul may be a quality of matter. This great truth, deep reflection, and a thorough comprehenſion of the Newtonian Philoſophy, enabled *Baxter* to demonſtrate. On the other hand, no reflection, no Philoſophy, but mere *in-*

[16] Vol. iii. p. 547.

Digitized by Google

tuitive knowledge, led his Lordſhip to conclude that it is ſo far from being a *contradiction*, that it is a real fact, that the *ſoul is a quality of matter*. But, hear his own marvelous words, "I am perſuaded that "God can make material ſyſtems capable "of thought, becauſe I muſt renounce one "of the kinds of knowledge that he has "given me, and the firſt, tho' not the "principal in the order of knowing, or "admit that HE HATH DONE SO [17]." Locke only contended for the bare *poſſibility*. His Lordſhip has found it to be a fact. So fairly has the diſciple outdone his Maſter.

3. But let us now go on with the great principles which ſupport his Lordſhip's Syſtem. His third is the FALSHOOD of the *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian* REVELATIONS. And here you will find no argument omitted that bears with the leaſt force againſt either of them. It is true, not one of them is his own. I mean, of thoſe deſerving the name of argument. They are all borrowed from the minute Philoſophers who went before him. And, of theſe his Lord-

[17] Vol. iii. p. 531.

ſhip

ſhip is a very obſervant and humble imitator.

His attack on revealed Religion is in two parts. The *firſt*, a confutation of it's truth, as it lies in it's purity, in ſacred Scripture: the *ſecond*, an inſinuation of it's falſhood, as it is ſeen in it's abuſes and corruptions, in particular Churches.

Judaiſm is attacked more fully and avowedly in the firſt way: and *Chriſtianity*, in the ſecond.

1. All the arguments againſt Revelation, as it is repreſented in the Bible, are taken from BLOUNT, TOLAND, COLLINS, CHUBB, MORGAN, and their fellows. I muſt, except, indeed, the atrocious terms in which they are commonly inforced. For the iniquity of the times would not ſuffer thoſe confeſſors of truth *to put forth more than half their ſtrength*, as his Lordſhip himſelf aſſures us [18]. When I ſay his arguments are all taken from theſe men, I do not ſpeak it, in diſparagement of the reaſoning. On the contrary, this is by far the moſt plauſible part of theſe voluminous *Eſſays*.

[18] Vol. iv. p. 163.

One

Digitized by Google

One thing, indeed, falls out unluckily. All his Lordſhip's great originals profeſſed to believe the MORAL ATTRIBUTES of the deity, in common with the reſt of mankind: And on that principle inforced their arguments againſt the truth of revealed Religion: and indeed what other principle is there that will afford ground for a ſingle objection againſt it? Now his Lordſhip profeſſes to have no idea of theſe *moral attributes*. No matter. They were neceſſary to be taken into ſervice here, for the completion of his ſchemes. And a Philoſopher can drop his principle as a politician does his friend, when he is of no uſe, and renew his acquaintance again when he wants him. Theſe diſcarded *attributes* therefore are on this occaſion taken into favour; ſoon again to be diſmiſſed, and his OLD PRINCIPLE reaſſumed, when he wants to guard againſt the terrors of a future ſtate; in which, to do it juſtice, it performs true Knights-ſervice. Much indeed is it to be lamented, that his *old principle* ſhould ever grow capricious; and that when it had ſo effectually excluded God's moral Government as recommended by *natural Religion*, it ſhould oppoſe itſelf to thoſe arguments

Digitized by Google

ments which are for excluding God's moral government as recommended by *Revelation.*

An hiſtorical deduction of the abuſes and corruptions of Chriſtianity in the CHURCH OF ROME, to advance ſuperſtition, fanaticiſm, and ſpiritual tyranny, makes the ſecond part of his Lordſhip's reaſoning againſt REVELATION; and the ſubject of the largeſt of his *four Eſſays.*

On this head he expatiates in all the forms of Piety, Patriotiſm, and Humanity. He bewails the diſhonours done to Religion; he reſents the violations of civil Liberty; and he vindicates the common ſenſe of mankind from the ſcholaſtic jargon of an ignorant, debauched, and avaricious Clergy.

Felicia tempora, quæ te
Moribus opponunt: habeat jam ROMA pudorem.

On ſo trite a topic, the topic of every true Proteſtant from Fox to Mr. Chandler, that is, from the firſt to the laſt good writer upon the ſubject, his Lordſhip may be excuſed for unloading his Common-place. Whatever there is of a better taſte, he has taken from Hooker, Stillingfleet, Barrow, and ſuch

Digitized by Google

ſuch other of the Engliſh Clergy who have moſt ſucceſsfully detected the errors and uſurpations of Popery.

But as the object of our Divines in this detection was to recommend the Goſpel-truth; and of his Lordſhip, to diſcredit it; he had need of other helps: And theſe, too, were at hand; ſuch as Hobbes, Toland, Tindal, Gordon; whom he faithfully copies, both in exaggerating the abuſes, and in drawing falſe conſequences from the reform of them. Thus, according to thoſe Divines who wrote *for truth*, SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY was modeſtly complained of as hindering the advancement of real knowledge; as keeping men buſied in trifling controverſies, and as making them often miſtake words for things. But with my Lord, and theſe his better guides, who wrote *againſt Revelation*, SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY is boldly accuſed to have blotted out all knowledge, and to have left nothing in it's ſtead but *madneſs*, *frenzy*, and *delirium*.

So again, The end of thoſe Divines in expoſing human uſurpations, was to introduce a RELIGIOUS SOCIETY on the principles of Goſpel-liberty: but the end of theſe Philoſophers in decrying Popery is to eſtabliſh

Digitized by Google

bliſh a *civil*, in the place of a *religious* uſurpation, and to make the CHURCH A CREATURE OF THE STATE.

In the mean time, he ſays *boldly* and well, "That ſome men are IMPUDENT enough "to *pretend*, others SILLY enough to *be-* "*lieve*, that they adhere to the Goſpel, "and maintain the cauſe of God againſt "infidels and heretics, when they do no- "thing better nor more than expoſe the "conceits of men [19]." But while he is thus buſy in obſerving what happens at one end of this common fallacy, he ſuffers himſelf to ſlip in, at the other: and does juſt the ſame *againſt* the Goſpel, which theſe men do *for* it. He expoſes the knavery of powerful Churchmen, and the folly of profound Divines; and then *pretends*, or *believes*, he hath diſcredited Revelation itſelf. However, to part friends with the *Divines*, after ſo many hard words, he teaches them how to prop up, in ſome *plauſible* way, their bungling ſyſtems of ARTIFICIAL THEOLOGY, juſt as he had before taught God Almighty himſelf to mend his *two Diſpenſations*. "Let us (ſays he) "ſuppoſe a Theiſt objecting — the be-

[19] Vol. iv. p. 385.

"liever

" liever might reply — he might add —
" he might add — and all this with great
" *plauſibility* at leaſt [20]." You will ſay now, I envy my Lord the glory of his inſtructions to defend *artificial theology*, or otherwiſe I, who am not ſparing of my quotations, would have given them at large. To tell you the truth, I ſuppreſſed them with deſign; to excite the Reader's curioſity. It is ſaid there is occaſion for it: and that the Public does not yet appear diſpoſed to pay that profound attention to the *firſt Philoſophy* as might be wiſhed on the firſt appearance of ſo great a bleſſing. You will ſuſpect, by what you have ſeen in my firſt Letter, that the Public may be ſomewhat *overdoſed*, and ſo has *kecked* a little. But it is to be hoped, his Followers will ſoon reconcile them to their Phyſic.

4. His Lordſhip's fourth and laſt great principle is the IMPOSSIBILITY of REVELATION in general.

He has refuſed no arms, we ſee, to combat the Revelations God hath *actually given*. He would ſeem to relax a little of his ſeverity, as to thoſe which God may *poſſibly give*: for in one place he ſays, *he*

[20] Vol. v. p. 279.

will

Digitized by Google

will not abſolutely pronounce againſt the poſſibility of God's revealing his will to man. But whether he equivocates, whether he altered his mind, or whether he ſimply forgot himſelf (a matter of little conſequence) moſt true it is, that he hath formally laid down, and largely inſiſted upon, certain principles, which make *revealed Religion* a thing UTTERLY IMPOSSIBLE.

Firſt, As to INSPIRATION, he not only denies all *reality* in the thing, but will not allow ſo much as any *meaning* in the word. And a MIRACLE, he holds to be impoſſible, what never was, nor ever can be. But now, without the *firſt*, no divine meſſenger could be ſent; for he muſt receive his orders from God: and without the *ſecond*, no divine meſſenger would be believed; for he muſt have his credentials to ſhew to Man: and theſe credentials, on his Lordſhip's own principles, can be no other than *miracles*.

But here again you are to obſerve, that on this ſubject likewiſe Infidelity is no more indebted to him than for his good will. All he urges againſt *inſpiration* and *miracles* having been firſt urged by HOBBES and SPINOZA: by the one, with more ſubtilty and

Digitized by Google

and exactneſs; by the other, with infinite more elegance.

Secondly, His Lordſhip holds the RELIGION OF NATURE to be full, perfect, and well underſtood. He holds, likewiſe, that the only conceivable purpoſe of *Revelation* muſt be to *republiſh* the *Religion of Nature*. The conſequence is, and this his Lordſhip gives us to underſtand, he ſaw, that the uſe of *Revelation* becomes ſuperſeded. For if it teaches *more* than natural Religion taught, or *different* from what it taught, the Revelation muſt be falſe; if only the *ſame*, it is evidently ſuperfluous.

Thirdly, His Lordſhip utterly rejects a PARTICULAR PROVIDENCE. But a revealed Religion is nothing elſe than the exerciſe of that very providence to ſome declared end in the moral Syſtem.

On all theſe accounts, he concludes, and conſequentially enough, that REASON HAS NOTHING FURTHER TO DO, WHEN REVELATION BEGINS [20].

You have now, Sir, the whole of his Lordſhip's SYSTEM, together with his topics in ſupport of it, both very ſuccinctly

[20] Vol. v. p. 274.

deli-

Digitized by Google

delivered: enough however to ſhew you that theſe famous ESSAYS which you have heard ſo often cried up as the very Mine, the native Treaſury of all divine and human truths, are indeed little other than the *Magazine* or Warehouſe of other men's lumber: or (not to diſhonour his Lordſhip by a mechanical compariſon) like the mouth of your neighbouring SEVERN, turbulent and dirty: which, let fableing *Poets* ſay what they pleaſe, we are ſure never derived it's ſource from the pure and perennial Urn of a *Demigod:* but, if one may gueſs from the taſte and colour, became thus conſiderable for it's bulk by the confluence of ſhallow brooks and babbling rivulets; of ſtagnant ditches, common-ſewers, and yet ſtranger mixtures; ſcouted off and put into a ferment by the haſty rage of ſome peeviſh land-torrent.

THE main pillar of his Syſtem, you ſee, is this extravagant paradox, *That we have* NO ADEQUATE *ideas of God's moral attributes, his* GOODNESS *and* JUSTICE, *as we have of his natural, his Wiſdom and Power.* And here, let me obſerve once for all, that his Lordſhip uſes the words, *inadequate*

Digitized by Google

ideas, and, *no ideas*, as terms of the ſame import. And as I think, not improperly, I have followed him in the indifferent uſe of either expreſſion. For the reaſon of his calling our ideas of God's *moral attributes*, INADEQUATE, is, becauſe he denies goodneſs and juſtice to be the ſame IN KIND, in God as in Man: But if not the ſame *in kind*, we cannot ſurely have *any* idea of them, becauſe we have no idea of any *other kind* of goodneſs and juſtice.

As the reaſoning on this head, contrary to his uſual wont, is entirely his own; and beſides, an extreme curioſity in itſelf, I will once more go a little out of my way, to ſet it in a true light; that it may neither impoſe by it's novelty; nor too much ſhock you and all good men by it's unchecked atrocity. The reſt are adopted impieties, of a paultry plebeian race; but inſerted, tho' in a contrary courſe, into this noble ſtock, with the ſpirit of CLODIUS's famous adoption of old, only for the ſake of public miſchief.

His three Poſitions are, That, by *metaphyſics*, or the reaſoning *a priori*, we can gain no knowledge of God at all.

That our knowledge of his *attributes* is are to be acquired only by a contemplation on

Digitized by Google

on his *Works*, or by the reaſoning *a poſteriori*.

That in this way, we can only arrive at the knowledge of his *natural* attributes, not of his *moral*.

" It is from the conſtitution of the " world ALONE (ſays his Lordſhip) and " from the ſtate of mankind in it, that we " can *acquire any ideas* of the divine attri- " butes, or a *right to affirm any thing about* " *them* [1]."

" The knowledge of the Creator is on " many accounts neceſſary to ſuch a crea- " ture as man: and therefore we are made " able to arrive by a proper exerciſe of our " mental faculties, *from a knowledge of* " *God's works to a knowledge of his exiſtence*, " and of that infinite POWER and WISDOM " which are demonſtrated to us in them. " OUR KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING GOD " GOES NO FURTHER [2]."

" Artificial Theology connects by very " problematical reaſoning *a priori*, MORAL " *attributes*, ſuch as we conceive them, " and ſuch as they are relatively to us, " with the *phyſical* attributes of God; " tho' there be no ſufficient foundation

[1] Vol. v. p. 331. [2] Vol. iv. p. 86.

Digitized by Google

" for this proceeding, nay, tho' *the phæ-*
" *nomena are in ſeveral caſes repugnant*[3]."

Having thus aſſured us that the ideas of God's *moral attributes* are to be got by no reaſoning at all, either *a priori* or *a poſteriori*, the only two ways we have to knowledge; He rightly concludes, that if man has ſuch ideas, they were not *found* but *invented* by him. And therefore, that nothing might be wanting to the full dilucidation of this curious point, he acquaints us who were the Authors of the fiction, and how ſtrangely the thing came about.

" Some of the Philoſophers (ſays his
" Lordſhip) having been led by a more full
" and accurate contemplation of Nature to
" the knowledge of a ſupreme ſelf-exiſtent
" Being of infinite *power and wiſdom*, and
" the firſt Cauſe of all things, were not
" contented with this degree of knowledge.
" They MADE A SYSTEM of God's MO-
" RAL as well as *phyſical* attributes, BY
" WHICH TO ACCOUNT FOR THE PRO-
" CEEDINGS OF HIS PROVIDENCE [4]."

Theſe Philoſophers then, it ſeems, *invented* the ſyſtem of God's *moral attributes*, in order to account for the difficulties ariſing

[3] Vol. v. p. 316. [4] Vol. iv. p. 48.

from

Digitized by Google

from the view of God's moral government. If the World had till now been ſo dull as to have no conception of theſe Attributes; his Lordſhip's Philoſophers, we ſee, made ample amends; who were ſo quick witted as to conceive, and ſo ſharp ſighted as to perceive, the obliquities of a *crooked* line before they had got any idea of a *ſtraight* one. For juſt to this, neither more nor leſs, does his Lordſhip's profound obſervation concerning this profounder diſcovery amount, when he ſays, *they made a Syſtem of God's moral attributes, by which to account for the proceedings of his Providence.*

This *invention* of his Lordſhip's old Philoſophers would put one in mind of an ingenious Modern, the curious SANCHO PANÇA; who, as his hiſtorian tells us, was very inquiſitive to find out the Author of that very uſeful *invention* we call SLEEP: for, with this worthy Magiſtrate, Sleep and good Cheer were the *Firſt Philoſophy.* Now the things ſought after by Sancho and his Lordſhip were at no great diſtance: for if *Sleeping* began when men firſt ſhut their eyes, it is certain the *idea of God's Goodneſs* appeared as ſoon as ever they opened them.

Digitized by Google

Dr. Clarke's Demonſtration of the moral attributes *a priori*, I ſhall leave, as his Lordſhip is pleaſed to do, in all it's force. If the Doctor's followers think their Maſter's honour concerned, where his arguments are not, they have a large field and a ſafe to ſhew their proweſs.

I rather chuſe to undertake his Lordſhip on his own terms, without any other arms than the arguments *a poſteriori*. For he is ſuch a Champion for the good Cauſe, that he not only appoints his adverſaries the field, but preſcribes to them the uſe of their weapons.

But his Lordſhip, like other great men, is not eaſily approached; and when he is, not always fit to be ſeen. You catch his FIRST PHILOSOPHY, as Butler's Hero did Ariſtotle's FIRST MATTER, *undreſſed, and without a rag of form*, but flaunting and fluttering in FRAGMENTS. To ſpeak plainly, his Lordſhip's entire want of method betrays him into endleſs REPETITIONS: and in theſe, whether for want of preciſion in his ideas, propriety in his terms, or art in his compoſition, the queſtion is perpetually changing; and rarely without being new covered by an equivocal expreſſion. If you add to this, the perpetual

Digitized by Google

perpetual CONTRADICTIONS into which he falls, either by defect of memory, exceſs of paſſion, or diſtreſs of argument, you will allow it to be no eaſy matter to take him fairly, to know him fully, and to repreſent him to the beſt advantage; in none of which offices would I be willingly defective. Indeed, when you have done this, the buſineſs is over; and his Lordſhip's reaſoning generally confutes itſelf.

When I reflect upon what this has coſt me, no leſs than the reading over two or three bulky Volumes to get poſſeſſion of a ſingle argument; which now you think you hold, and then again you loſe; it meets you full when you leaſt expect it, and it ſlips away from you the very moment it promiſes to do moſt: when, I ſay, I reflect upon all this, I cannot but lament the hard luck of our CLERGY, who, tho' leaſt fit, and indeed leaſt *concerned*, as there is nothing that can impoſe on a Scholar, and a great deal that may miſlead the People, are likely to be the men moſt engaged in this controverſy with his Lordſhip. Time was, when if a Writer had a diſpoſition to ſeek objections to Religion, tho' he found them hardly, and they moved heavily, yet he would digeſt his thoughts, and range his arguments, and me-

Digitized by Google

thodize his reaſoning. The Clergy had then nothing to do but to anſwer him, if they could. But ſince this ſlovenly cuſtom (as Lord SHAFTSBURY calls it) of *taking their phyſic in public*, has got amongſt our Free-thinkers, that is, of doſeing themſelves well with doubts; and then as haſtily diſcharging their looſe and crude indigeſtions into *Fragments*; things which, in their very name, imply not ſo much the want, as the excluſion of all *Form*; the advocate of Religion has had a double labour: he muſt work them into conſiſtence, he muſt mould them into ſhape, before he can lay hold of them ſafely, or preſent them handſomely. But theſe Gentlemen have taken care that a Clergyman ſhould not be idle. He finds the ſame to do in the diſcharge of his *office paſtoral*. All he had of old to attend was the ſaving the ſouls of thoſe committed to his care. He muſt now begin his work a great deal higher; he muſt firſt convince his flock that they have a ſoul to be ſaved. And the ſpite of all is, that at the time his kind maſters have thus doubled his taſk, they appear very well diſpoſed to leſſen his wages.

We have obſerved, that the DENIAL of God's *moral attributes* is the great barrier againſt

Digitized by Google

againſt Religion in general: but it is more eſpecially ſerviceable in his Lordſhip's idioſyncratic terrors; the terrors of a *future State*. To theſe we owe his famous book of FRAGMENTS, compoſed occaſionally, and taken as an extemporaneous cordial, each ſtronger than the other, to ſupport himſelf under his frequent paroxyſms.

For, ſet the *moral attributes* aſide, and we can neither form any judgment of the *end* of man, nor of the *nature* of God's moral government. All our knowledge will be then confined to our *preſent* ſtate and condition. It is by theſe attributes alone, we learn, that man was made for *happineſs*; and that God's diſpenſation to us *here* is but *part* of our moral ſyſtem: This naturally extends our views to, and terminates our knowledge in, the certainty of a *future ſtate*.

The FATE of all Religion therefore being included in the queſtion of God's *moral attributes*, I hold it of importance to prove, againſt his Lordſhip, that MEN MAY ACQUIRE ADEQUATE IDEAS OF THEM in the ſame way, and with equal certainty, that his Lordſhip in the following words hath ſhewn us, we acquire the knowledge of God's *natural attributes*.

" All

Digitized by Google

" All our knowledge of God (ſays he) " is derived from his works. Every part " of the immenſe univerſe, and the or- " der and harmony of the Whole, are " not only conformable to our ideas or " notions of WISDOM and POWER, but " theſe ideas and notions were impreſſed " originally and principally by them, on " every attentive mind; and men were led " to conclude, with the utmoſt certain- " ty, that a Being of infinite *wiſdom* and " *power* made, preſerved, and governed " the ſyſtem. As far as we can diſcover, " we diſcern theſe in all his works; and " where we cannot diſcern them, it is " manifeſtly due to our imperfection, not " to his. This now is real knowledge, " or there is no ſuch thing as knowledge. " We acquire it immediately in the objects " themſelves, in God, and in Nature, the " work of God. We know what *wiſdom* " and *power* are: we know both intuitive- " ly, and by the help of our ſenſes, that " ſuch as we conceive them to be, ſuch " they appear in the Work: and therefore " we know demonſtratively that ſuch they " are in the Worker [5]."

[5] Vol v. p. 524.

All

Digitized by Google

All this is mighty well: and on theſe very grounds I undertake to prove that men may get as clear and as preciſe ideas of God's GOODNESS and JUSTICE, as of his *wiſdom* and *power*.

But, to prevent, or, indeed, now things are ſo far gone, rather to *redreſs*, all ambiguity in the terms, and equivocation in the uſe of them; it will be proper to explain what true PHILOSOPHY means by GOD'S WORKS, whether *phyſical* or *moral*.

Now I underſtand by it, that CONSTITUTION OF THINGS which God hath eſtabliſhed and directed, tending to a plain and evident end: without regard to thoſe impediments or obſtructions in it's courſe, which the Author of nature hath permitted to ariſe from any part of the *material*, or *intellectual* Creation.

Thus, when we conſider his *phyſical* works, in order to make our eſtimate of his *wiſdom* and *power*, we conceive them as they are in themſelves; and in the perfection of their Conſtitution; tho' the great portion of the *phyſical* ſyſtem may, from the intractability of matter, be ſubject to ſome *inconſiderable irregularities*, which, as the true PHILOSOPHER obſerves

with

Digitized by Google

will be apt to increaſe till this ſyſtem wants a reformation: and tho' the ſmaller portions, ſuch as the bodies of animals, may, from various accidents in their conception and birth, often want that convenient formation and adaption of their parts, from the wonderful contrivance of which, in the various bodies of all animals in general, ariſes ſo illuſtrious an evidence of the *wiſdom* and *power* of the Workman.

Surely, then, common ſenſe, and all equitable meaſure, require us to eſtimate God's *moral works* on the ſame ſtandard: to conſider what the moral *conſtitution is in itſelf:* and (when the queſtion is of God's *goodneſs* and *juſtice)* to keep that view diſtinct and ſeparate: nor ſuffer it to be diſturbed or broken by any interruptions occaſioned thro' the perverſe influence either of the paſſion or action of material or immaterial Beings. For, in this caſe, Both concur to violate the Conſtitution. In the *natural* ſyſtem, man's *Free-will* has no place: in the *moral*, the abuſe of *Free-will* occaſions the moſt and greateſt of it's diſorders.

In proſecuting this queſtion therefore, As, in order to acquire and confirm our ideas of God's *wiſdom* and *power*, we con-

Digitized by Google

ſider the *natural ſyſtem* only as it's order and harmony is ſupported by the *general Laws* of matter and motion: ſo, in order to acquire and confirm our ideas of his *goodneſs* and *juſtice*, we ſhould regard the *moral ſyſtem* only as it's order and harmony is ſupported by that GENERAL LAW, which annexes *happineſs to virtue, and miſery to vice.*

Thus much, and only thus much, is *God's work*, in either ſyſtem: and it is from *God's work* we are to demonſtrate his *attributes.* The reſt, where real or apparent diſorders obtrude themſelves, to obſtruct our views in theſe diſcoveries, proceeds from *matter* and the *human mind.*

And it is not to be forgotten, that the concluſion we draw from hence, in ſupport of our *adequate* ideas of God's *moral* attributes, has the greater ſtrength upon his Lordſhip's own principles; who holds, that this Conſtitution ariſes *ſolely from the* WILL of God: For then we are ſure that the WILL, which annexes happineſs to virtue, and miſery to vice, muſt ariſe from God's *moral* rather than from his firſt *phyſical* nature.

Having premiſed thus much, tho' no more than neceſſary to obviate one continued

Digitized by Google

tinued SOPHISM, that runs thro' all his Lordſhip's reaſonings, againſt the *moral attributes:* where, the courſe and operation of that *moral* Conſtitution as it appears under the diſturbances occaſioned by man's *free-will*, is perpetually put for the *Conſtitution itſelf:* I now proceed to ſhew, from GOD's WORKS, that we have as preciſe ideas of his GOODNESS and JUSTICE as of his *power* and *wiſdom.*

His Lordſhip obſerves, that *from every part of the immenſe univerſe, and from the harmony of the whole, men are led to conclude, with the utmoſt certainty, that a Being of infinite wiſdom and power made, preſerved, and governed the ſyſtem.* And what ſhould hinder the Religioniſt from obſerving, that the happineſs attendant on virtue, and the miſery conſequent on vice by the very Conſtitution of nature, lead men to conclude, with equal certainty, that a Being of infinite *goodneſs* and *juſtice* made, preſerves, and governs the ſyſtem?

The exiſtence of this *moral Conſtitution* his Lordſhip acknowledges. Let us conſider it, therefore, both as it reſpects BODIES of men, and INDIVIDUALS.

That *Communities* are always happy or miſerable

Digitized by Google

miſerable in proportion to their virtuous or vicious manners, his Lordſhip himſelf is the forwardeſt to demonſtrate. If ſuch a Conſtitution of things does not beſpeak the Author of it *good* and *juſt*, how is it poſſible to conclude any thing of the character of a Creator from his Works? His Lordſhip thinks, that from the marks of *wiſdom* and *power* in the *phyſical ſyſtem* we learn with the utmoſt certainty that God is wiſe and powerful; and he ſays, that we acquire this knowledge immediately, as it were, by our ſenſes. Are there not the ſelf ſame marks of *goodneſs* and *juſtice* in this part at leaſt of the *moral ſyſtem?* And do not we come to know as immediately by our ſenſes, and as certainly by our reaſon, that God is good and juſt?

If we conſider the *moral Conſtitution*, as it reſpects *Particulars*, we ſee virtue and vice have the ſame influence on our happineſs and miſery. Here, indeed, we find more interruptions, in the means to the end, than in the other part. Our material and our intellectual Nature have here more power to diſorder the operations of the Syſtem. In *Communities*, they can rarely be diſturbed, but by a Peſtilence, or that other moral Plague, a Hero or a Conqueror: Amongſt

Digitized by Google

Amongſt *Particulars*, phyſical evil and the abuſe of free-will bring more frequent diſorders. But when once the demonſtration of the *moral attributes* is clearly made from that part of the conſtitution which regards *Communities*, it can never be ſhaken by the diſorders in the other part of it, which regards *Particulars*. The eſtabliſhed truth is now a Principle to proceed upon in our diſcoveries; and as to the interruptions in the latter inſtance, all we can fairly deduce from thence is, the CERTAINTY of a *future State*. But this by the way.

What I inſiſt upon at preſent is, that, to decide the queſtion concerning God's attributes, we are to conſider the Conſtitution of things, as it is in itſelf, ſimply; this is, properly, *God's work*. The diſorders in it, occaſioned by the abuſe of man's *free-will*, is not his Work, but man's. This, his Lordſhip too, upon another occaſion, namely, when he combats the argument of a *future ſtate* from an unequal Providence, is perpetually repeating. So that theſe diſorders muſt, even on his Lordſhip's own principles, be excluded from the account, when we eſtimate God's Nature and *Attributes* from his *Works*.

But

Digitized by Google

But we do not ſee thoſe diſorders in the *natural* world which we both ſee and feel in the *moral*. This would be ſome objection did God direct things *immediately*, or conſtitute them *mechanically*, in the moral, as he does in the natural Syſtem; or had Free-will the ſame influence on the latter as on the former. — Did God direct in both Conſtitutions, or did he direct in neither, *immediately* or *mechanically*, and that yet the *moral* continued more ſubject to diſorder than the *natural*, it might then indeed follow that we had not ſo clear ideas of God's *goodneſs* and *juſtice* as of his *wiſdom* and *power*. But ſince he has thought fit to leave man, FREE; and has been pleaſed to ſuffer the abuſe of free-will to affect the *moral* ſyſtem, and not the *natural*; the ſuperior irregularities in the *one* do not take off from the equal clearneſs of the demonſtration which reſults from the nature of *both* Conſtitutions. "This differ-
"ence (to ſpeak in the words of a late
"writer) is not to be aſcribed to a
"contrary conduct in the Governor of the
"two Syſtems, but to the contrary natures
"of the Subjects. Paſſive matter being to-
"tally inert, it's reſiſtance to the Laws im-

Digitized by Google

" preſſed upon it, muſt be extremely weak:
" and conſequently the diſorders ariſing
" from that reſiſtance proportionably ſlow
" and unheeded: while that active ſelf-
" moving principle, the Mind, flies out at
" once from the centre of its direction,
" and can every moment deflect from the
" line of truth and reaſon. Hence moral
" diſorders began early, became exceſſive,
" and have continued, through all ages, to
" diſturb the harmony of the Syſtem [6]."

What is here ſaid will, I ſuppoſe, be ſufficient to confute the following aſſertions; and to detect the miſtake on which they ariſe.

" Every thing (ſays his Lordſhip) ſhews
" the *wiſdom* and *power* of God conformably
" to our ideas of wiſdom and power in the
" *phyſical* world and in the *moral*. *But*
" *every thing does not ſhew in like manner*
" *the juſtice and goodneſs conformably to our*
" *ideas of theſe attributes in either. The*
" *phyſical attributes are in their nature*
" *more glaring and leſs equivocal* [7]."

And again. " There is *no ſufficient*

[6] *The principles of natural and revealed Religion, in a courſe of Sermons at Lincoln's-Inn.* Vol. i. p. 66.

[7] Vol. v. p. 524.

" *founda-*

Digitized by Google

" *foundation* in the phænomena of nature " to connect the moral attributes with the " phyſical attributes of God. *Nay, the* " *phænomena are in ſeveral caſes repugnant* " [8]."

But ſince he goes ſo far as to talk of the *want of a foundation*, and even a *repugnancy*; Before I proceed with the main branch of my reaſoning, I will juſt urge one ſingle argument for the reality and full evidence of the *moral attributes:* and it ſhall be taken from himſelf, and ſhall conclude on his own principles.

He tells us, that ſuch as he, " who " apply themſelves to the *firſt Philoſophy*, " apply themſelves to the nobleſt objects " that can demand the attention of the " mind — To the ſignification of GOD'S " WILL, concerning the duties we owe to " him, and to one another [9]."

And again, " It is ſufficient to eſtabliſh " our moral obligations that we conſider " them relatively to our own ſyſtem. " From thence they ariſe: and ſince they " ariſe from thence, it muſt be the WILL of

[8] Vol. v. p. 316. [9] Vol. v. p. 447.

Digitized by Google

" that Being who made the ſyſtem, that we " ſhould obſerve and practiſe them [10]."

Let me aſk then, How it is that we collect this WILL from the objects which his Lordſhip allows us to contemplate, namely, his WORKS *in this ſyſtem?* He will ſay from certain *qualities* in thoſe objects. — What are thoſe qualities? He will reply, the *fitneſſes* of means to ends. — Who was the Author of theſe fitneſſes? He hath told us, the *God of nature.* — It was God's *will* then we ſhould uſe the *means* in order to obtain the *ends.* Now, in the *moral* ſyſtem, the means are virtuous practice; the end, happineſs. Virtue therefore muſt needs be pleaſing to him; and Vice, as it's contrary, diſpleaſing. Well, but then, as to this *like* and *diſlike*; it muſt be either capricious, or it muſt be regulated on the nature of things. *Wiſdom*, which his Lordſhip condeſcends to give his Maker, will not allow us to ſuppoſe it capricious. It is regulated therefore on the nature of things. But if the nature of things be, as his Lordſhip holds it is, the conſtitution of God, and *dependent on his will*, then he who is pleaſed with virtue,

[10] Vol. v. p. 452.

and

Digitized by Google

and diſpleaſed with vice, muſt needs be himſelf *good* and *juſt*.

To proceed now with my main argument. His Lordſhip goes on thus. *But men not only might collect God's natural attributes from the phyſical ſyſtem, but in effect they did: and all men, at all times, had theſe notions ſo ſtrongly impreſſed on them, that they were led to conclude with the utmoſt certainty for a Being of infinite power and wiſdom.*

I deſire to know in what time or place it ever happened, before his Lordſhip philoſophiſed at *Batterſea*, that a Man, who believed God's infinite wiſdom and power, did not with equal confidence believe his infinite goodneſs and juſtice? In truth, theſe two ſets of ideas, the *phyſical* and *moral* attributes of the Deity, were equally extenſive, they were equally ſteady, and they were always till now inſeparable.

He ſays, that *as far as we can diſcover, we diſcern infinite wiſdom and power in all God's works: and where we cannot diſcern them, it is manifeſtly due to our imperfection not to his.*

What his Lordſhip here ſays will deſerve to be well conſidered. A compariſon, we ſee, is inſinuated between our diſcovery of

Digitized by Google

infinite power; and wiſdom, from the *phyſical* works of God; and our diſcovery of infinite goodneſs and juſtice, from his *moral* works; in which the advantage is given to the former. Now, to come to any clear deciſion in this point (omitting at preſent the notice of his general Sophiſm which operates in this obſervation, as in the reſt) we muſt diſtinguiſh between the *means of acquiring* the knowledge of God's attributes, and that *knowledge when acquired*. As to the firſt, the *means of acquiring*, there ſeems to be ſome advantage on the ſide of God's phyſical works. For, as his Lordſhip rightly obſerves, *where we cannot diſcern wiſdom and power in the phyſical works it is due to our imperfection, not to his: for as men advance in the knowledge of nature we ſee more and more of wiſdom and power*. And he inſinuates, we cannot ſay the ſame concerning the difficulties in the *moral* ſyſtem. It is true, we cannot. But then let us tell him, neither can we ſay the contrary. The reaſon is, The phyſical ſyſtem lies open to our enquiries; and by the right application of our ſenſes, to well tried experiments, we are able to make conſiderable advances in the knowledge of Nature.

Digitized by Google

ture. It is not ſo in the *moral* ſyſtem; all we know here are a few general principles concerning its Conſtitution; and further than this, human wit or induſtry can never get. Theſe general principles, indeed, are amply ſufficient to deduce and eſtabliſh the *moral attributes* from the *moral ſyſtem*, but not ſufficient to remove difficulties that ariſe from what we ſee of the actual adminiſtration of that ſyſtem. So that, tho' *we* cannot ſay, that *as we advance in the knowledge* of the moral ſyſtem *we ſee more and more of goodneſs and juſtice:* So neither can *his Lordſhip* ſay (tho' his words ſeem to inſinuate he could) that as we advance, we ſee *leſs and leſs*. Whereas the truth is we cannot advance at all, beyond thoſe few general principles.

But then, on the other hand, with regard to the *knowledge of the attributes, when acquired*, I hold the advantage, and a very great one it is, lies altogether on the ſide of the MORAL. And this, I cannot better explain to you than in the words of a late writer, quoted once before: "Tho' the "idea (ſays this Divine) of God's *natural* at-"tributes be as clear in the abſtract, as that "of his *moral*, yet the idea of his moral

Digitized by Google

" attributes is, in the concrete, more ade-
" quate than that of his natural. The reaſon
" ſeems convincing. The moral relation in
" which we ſtand to God, as free agents,
" is juſt the ſame whether man exiſts alone,
" or whether he be but a link in the chain
" of innumerable orders of intelligences
" ſurrounding the whole Creation. Hence
" we muſt needs have a full knowledge of
" our duty to him, and of his diſpoſition
" towards us; on which knowledge is
" founded the exactneſs of our conceptions
" of his moral attributes, his *juſtice* and
" *goodneſs*. But the natural relation in
" which we, or any of God's creatures,
" ſtand towards him, as material Beings, is
" not the ſame when conſidered ſimply, as
" when a portion of a dependent and con-
" nected whole. Becauſe whenever ſuch a
" whole exiſts, the harmony and perfection
" of it muſt firſt of all be conſulted. This
" harmony ariſeth from the mutual ſubſer-
" viency and union of it's parts. But this
" ſubſerviency may require a miniſtration of
" government, with regard to certain porti-
" ons of matter thus allied, different from
" what might have followed had thoſe por-
" tions ſtood alone, becauſe that preciſe diſ-
" poſition,

Digitized by Google

" poſition, which might be fit in one caſe " might be unfit in the other. Hence we, " who know there is a whole, of which " our material ſyſtem is a part; and yet are " totally ignorant both of it's nature and " extent, can have but a very confuſed idea " of that phyſical relation in which we " ſtand towards God: ſo that our con- " ceptions of his *natural* attributes, his " *power* and *wiſdom*, which are founded on " that idea, muſt in the concrete be propor- " tionably vague and inadequate [11]."

But you will aſk, perhaps, whence ariſes this reciprocal advantage which the *moral* and the *natural* attributes have over one another in the *means of acquiring* the knowledge of them, and the preciſion of *that knowledge when acquired?* I will tell you in two words. Of *our own* phyſical ſyſtem, we know many particulars, (that is, we diſcover much of the *means*, but nothing of the *end*) and of the *univerſal* phyſical ſyſtem we are entirely ignorant. On the other hand, we know but few particulars of *our own* moral ſyſtem, (that is, we diſcover only the *end*,

[11] *The principles of natural and revealed Religion, in a courſe of Sermons at Lincoln's Inn*, Vol. i. p. 58, *& ſeq.*

and

Digitized by Google

and not the *means*) and of the *univerſal* moral ſyſtem we know the general principles.

His Lordſhip proceeds. *This now* [the knowledge of God's *natural* attributes] *is real knowledge; or there is no ſuch thing as knowledge. We acquire it immediately in the objects themſelves,* IN GOD, *and in nature the work of God.*

What his Lordſhip means by, *in God*, diſtinct from the *work of God*, I confeſs I do not underſtand: Perhaps it may be intended to inſinuate, in honour of the *natural attributes* that they may be even proved *a priori*; for this is not the firſt time by many, when after having heartily abuſed a perſon or thing, he has been reduced to avail himſelf of the authority, or the reaſoning, they afford him. Or perhaps, it was only uſed to round the period, and ſet off his eloquence. However I agree with him, that this is *real knowledge*. And ſo too, I think, is the knowledge of the *moral* attributes, ſo gained. Why truly, ſays his Lordſhip, *I do allow juſt ſo much goodneſs and juſtice in God as we ſee in that* CONSTITUTION *which annexes happineſs to virtue and miſery to vice. But this*, ſays he, *I think, had better be called* WISDOM. I think ſo too; if by,

ſo

Digitized by Google

ſo much, he means no more than what concerns God's *natural government*. But I will venture to go further, and ſay, that, from what we ſee in this *conſtitution*, we may collect PERFECT goodneſs and juſtice. *Matter* and man's *Free-will* diſturb the Syſtem. But if the Conſtitution be the effect of God's *Will*, as his Lordſhip holds; and the mark of his *Wiſdom*, as all mankind hold; Does not that *Wiſdom* require that his *Will* ſhould not be defeated? Would it not be defeated, if the diſorders occaſioned by the perverſity of his creatures were not remedied and ſet right? And is not A REMEDY the cleareſt mark of *perfect goodneſs* and *juſtice?*

Take it in another light. Free-will croſſes the Conſtitution, which God, by eſtabliſhing, ſhews he intended ſhould take place. This *preſent* diſturbance could not have been prevented, becauſe, according to my Lord and his Poet, it was neceſſary to the ſchemes of divine wiſdom, that there ſhould be ſuch a creature as man:

" For in the ſcale of reaſoning life, 'tis plain
" There muſt be, ſomewhere, ſuch a rank as man.

the conſequence is, that the diſorder will be *hereafter rectified.*

Had

Digitized by Google

Had God indeed made Man *unneceſſarily*; and this Man had broke in upon God's Syſtem, his Lordſhip might then have had ſome pretence to ſay, as he does, that GOD MEANT THE SYSTEM SHOULD NOT BE FURTHER PURSUED; that is, that the SYSTEM, which annexes happineſs to virtue and miſery to vice, ſhould remain in it's preſent ſtate of an unperfected diſpenſation, to all eternity.

He goes on. *We know what* WISDOM *and* POWER *are. We know both intuitively, and by the help of our ſenſes, that ſuch as we conceive them to be, ſuch they appear in the* WORK; *and therefore we know demonſtratively that ſuch they are in the* WORKER.

And do we not know what GOODNESS and JUSTICE are? Do we not *intuitively*, and by the *help of our ſenſes know*, that ſuch as we conceive them to be, ſuch they appear in the WORK, namely, in that *conſtitution of things*, which, his Lordſhip tells us, annexes happineſs to virtue, and miſery to vice? And may we not *demonſtratively* collect from thence that ſuch they are in the WORKER? ſince this Conſtitution, his Lordſhip again tells us, is the effect of God's *will*. On his own principles therefore, applied

Digitized by Google

plied to his own ſtate of the reaſoning *a poſteriori*, it appears that God is of *infinite goodneſs* and *juſtice*, as well as of *wiſdom* and *power*. And was I to imitate his Lordſhip's language, I ſhould ſay of a man who denied all this,

— " O Medici, mediam pertundite venam :
" Delicias hominis !

But to give authority to this *prodigious* reaſoning, He, in one place, puts it into the mouth of *Anaxagoras*. " Should you aſk " *Anaxagoras* (ſays he) what *goodneſs* is, " or *juſtice?* He might bid you, perhaps, " turn your eyes inward, firſt; then, ſur- " vey mankind; obſerve the wants of in- " dividuals, the benefits of ſociety, and, " from theſe particulars, frame the general " notions of *goodneſs* and *juſtice*. He " might go a ſtep further; and add, this is " *human* goodneſs and *human* juſtice, ſuch " as we can comprehend, ſuch as we can " exerciſe; and ſuch as the ſupreme mind " has made it both our duty and intereſt to " exerciſe, by the conſtitution of the hu- " man ſyſtem, and by the relations which " ariſe in it: from all which our notions of " *goodneſs* and *juſtice* reſult, and are com- " pounded."

We

Digitized by Google

We know then, what *goodneſs* and *juſtice* are, as well as what *wiſdom* and *power* are; *we know both intuitively and by the help of our ſenſes, that ſuch as we conceive them to be, ſuch they appear in the work* — for he bids us to *turn our eyes inward* — then to *ſurvey mankind*, and laſtly, to obſerve how *reaſon*, from the *conſtitution of human nature*, confirms our *intuitive* knowledge, and that which we gain by the *help of our ſenſes*. But what does all this ſignify, if *Anaxagoras* or his Lordſhip be in an humour of concluding againſt their own premiſſes? — Hear then how the ſpeech ends. — "Of *divine goodneſs* and divine juſtice "might this Philoſopher conclude, I AM "UNABLE TO FRAME ANY ADEQUATE "NOTIONS [12]."

What? Unable to *frame* that which God by the *moral* conſtitution has *framed to our hands*; and by the declaration of his WILL has taught us to *apply*? In truth, his Lordſhip brings his old Sophiſts not, as one would expect, to chop Logic for *him*, but to play at *croſs purpoſes* with *us*. — *We* DO KNOW, ſays Anaxagoras, *what* Goodneſs *and* Juſtice *are: we know both intuitively,*

[12] Vol. iv. p. 116, 17.

Digitized by Google

and by the help of our ſenſes, that ſuch as we conceive them to be, ſuch they appear in the work; and THEREFORE *we* DO NOT KNOW *that ſuch they are in the worker.*

Might I be permitted to addreſs myſelf to this Renegado Sophiſt, I would ſay, — Your brethren, the antient Philoſophers, reaſoned *a poſteriori* in this manner, "Can you think there is *wiſdom* and *power* in you, and none in your Maker?" By no means. They reaſoned well. — Let me aſk you then, is there *goodneſs* and *juſtice* in you, and none in your Maker? His anſwer, I ſuppoſe, would be the ſame. But, prompted by his Lordſhip, into whoſe ſervice he is now entered, he perhaps might add, that from *human goodneſs* and *juſtice* we cannot come to the NATURE of the *divine*. What hinders us, I beſeech you? Is it not from our *intuitive conception* of our own *wiſdom* and *power* that we gain an adequate idea of God's? Are *wiſdom* and *power* MORE PERFECT as they are found in man, than *goodneſs* and *juſtice?* If therefore the IMPERFECTION of the human qualities hinder our acquiring an adequate idea of God's attributes, we can have no adequate idea of his *wiſdom* and *power:* If the IMPERFECTION does

Digitized by Google

does not hinder, then we may have an adequate idea of his *goodneſs* and *juſtice*.

But, the inference to God's *power* and *wiſdom*, his Lordſhip ſays, is ſupported by what men ſee of the effects in his Works; the order and harmony of the phyſical Syſtem. Do we not ſee likewiſe the effects of God's *goodneſs* and *juſtice*, in the happineſs that *naturally* attends virtue and the miſery conſequent on vice? And is not the *moral* order and harmony as much *God's Work*, as the *phyſical*?

Thus, Sir, you ſee, that by the *very reaſoning* his Lordſhip EMPLOYS to prove the *natural* attributes, and by the *very method* he PRESCRIBES to us for proving the *moral*, we have demonſtrated *theſe* with a preciſion and a certainty, at leaſt, equal to the other.

His Lordſhip ſeems to have been aware of the event; and therefore when he had ſet us at defiance, he tried to put the change upon us, by pretending to remind us that the *moral attributes* ſhould be examined by, or *applied to*, THE CONSTITUTION OF THE WORLD AND THE STATE OF MANKIND IN IT [13]. I had as much reaſon to be

[13] Vol. v. p. 331.

aware

Digitized by Google

aware of his Lordſhip. And therefore, in ſtating the queſtion, at my entrance on this ſubject, I obviated this miſerable Sophiſm. I call it by no better name, becauſe it is not *the conſtitution of the world or the ſtate of mankind in it*, but the CONSTITUTION OF THE MORAL SYSTEM, or the ſtate of virtue and vice, as they naturally operate to produce happineſs and miſery, by which God's *moral attributes* are to be tried and aſcertained. But this, which is a ſteady and uniform view, he would have us turn away from; to contemplate that obſcure, diſturbed, and ſhifting ſcene, the actual ſtate of vice and virtue, of miſery and happineſs, amongſt men. That is, he would have us conclude concerning God's nature, not from his VOLUNTARY CONSTITUTION of things, but from the breaches into that conſtitution by the abuſe of man's free-will: which yet, when he is arguing *for an equal providence*, he again and again confeſſes ought not to be charged upon God; and declaims violently againſt the folly of thoſe who impute the effects of that abuſe to him. While here, in his various attempts to blot out *the idea of God's moral attributes*, he is full

Digitized by Google

of the diſorders of the moral Syſtem as part of God's deſign. But now I have mentioned his arguments for an equal providence, I ſhould be unjuſt to You, who expect a fair *view* of his Lordſhip's Philoſophy from me, if I concealed another of his contradictions. — He had both a *future State* and *God's moral attributes* to throw out of the religious world; or, to ſpeak more properly, he had RELIGION to overturn by taking away it's very ESSENCE: and as the *irregularities* in the preſent adminiſtration of providence ſtood in the way of his firſt attempt; and the *conſiſtency* of the moral Syſtem in the way of the other; when he argues againſt a *future State*, You would think there were no *irregularities*; and when he argues againſt the *moral attributes*, You would think there was no *conſiſtency*.

We now come to his Lordſhip's particular objections againſt the *moral attributes*. One of them is, that they are BOUNDED.

" They [the Divines] go further. As " God is perfect and man very imperfect, " they talk of his *infinite goodneſs and juſ-* " *tice*, as of his infinite wiſdom and pow-

"er; tho' the latter may preſerve their "nature without any conceivable bounds, "and the former muſt ceaſe to be what "they are, unleſs we conceive them "BOUNDED. Their nature implies neceſ- "ſarily a limitation in the exerciſe of them. "Thus then the *moral attributes*, accord- "ing to this Theology, requires infinitely "more of God to man than men are able, "or would be obliged if they were able, "to exerciſe to one another: greater pro- "fuſion in beſtowing benefits and re- "wards, greater vigour in puniſhing of- "fences [14]."

You have here his Lordſhip's own words; and nothing leſs could induce any one to believe ſuch miſrepreſentations could come from one, who had ſet himſelf up for an univerſal Righter of wrongs and Redreſſer of grievances. Permit me to examine the *premiſſes*; together with the *inferences* both *implied* and *expreſſed*.

He ſays, 1. that the *moral attributes* are *bounded*; 2. that the *natural* are *not bounded*. Let us ſee to what the firſt propoſition amounts; and then, what truth there is in the ſecond.

[14] Vol. v. p. 528.

Digitized by Google

The *moral attributes* are conſidered by us as relative to *intelligent* creatures; the *natural* are not ſo conſidered. Thus the goodneſs and juſtice, when relative to man, are greatly *bounded:* a certain low degree of reward ſuffices for his *good*; a certain low degree of puniſhment for his *evil* actions. Let God's goodneſs and juſtice reſpect a higher rank of intelligent Beings, and they will be then *leſs bounded*; for greater rewards and puniſhments will be required: and ſo on, to the higheſt rank of intelligent creatures. Yet as the higheſt is at infinite diſtance from the Creator, the exerciſe of the moral attributes, (that is, as they bear relation to his intelligent creatures,) muſt be ſtill *bounded.*

His ſecond propoſition is, that the natutural attributes are *not bounded.* It is true, theſe cannot be conſidered as relative to God's *intelligent* creatures; yet ſince they muſt be conſidered, in *their exerciſe*, as relative to his Creation at large; and ſince Creation, however immenſe, is not infinite, the natural attributes ſo conſidered are not infinite: but if not infinite, they are *bounded.* There is no difference therefore, in *the exerciſe* of God's attributes, between

Digitized by Google

tween the *moral* and the *natural*, ſave only in the degree.

But if we conſider God's *moral* and *natural* attributes more abſtractedly, not as they are *in the exerciſe*, and relative to intelligent Beings, and to actual Creation, but as they are in his nature, then they are both *unbounded*. Thus we ſee his Lordſhip's notable diſtinction is groundleſs and imaginary.

But let us give him all he aſks, and then ſee what he will be able to *infer* from it. His firſt inference ſeems to be this, As the *moral* attributes are bounded, and not infinite like the *natural*, our idea of them muſt be cloudy, obſcure, inadequate. What! becauſe they are better adapted to human contemplation? As things *bounded* certainly are, than things *infinite*. Our idea of ſuch of God's attributes as bear relation to a Being, whoſe nature and properties we know, namely MAN, muſt needs be more adequate and better defined than the idea of ſuch attributes as bear relation to Beings, whoſe nature and properties we know not, namely the UNIVERSE.

Digitized by Google

Let us conſider his other *inference*, which he expreſſes in theſe words: *Thus then the moral attributes, according to this Theology, requires infinitely more of God to man than men are able, or would be obliged if they were able, to exerciſe to one another.*

To ſay the moral attributes, according to Chriſtian Theology, or, as he is pleaſed to call it, *artificial Theology*, requires INFINITELY *more*, is a wretched calumny. To ſay it *requires more* is true. And for this plain reaſon: the relation between Creator and Creature is very diſtant from that between Fellow-creatures; therefore the *goodneſs* more abundant: The relation between Lord and Servant is very diſtant from that between Fellow-ſervants; therefore the *juſtice* more ſevere. And if it would not be deemed too IMPUDENT to refer his Lordſhip to Scripture for inſtruction (eſpecially in a matter where the abuſe of Scripture was chiefly intended) he might there have found a *Parable* which would have ſet him right: and has always kept *artificial Theology*, whatever he might think, from going wrong.

But

Digitized by Google

But *infinite*, when applied to the *exerciſe* of a moral attribute in reference to man, is his Lordſhip's nonſenſe, with due reverence be it ſaid, not the *nonſenſe of artificial Divines*. They were not ignorant that the rule, *infirmiorem vel deteriorem partem ſequitur conſequentia*, held as well in *Morals* as in *Logic*. Tho' God be infinite, man is finite; and therefore, with reſpect to him, the exertion of a *moral* attribute is finite, not infinite. His Lordſhip himſelf ſaw ſomething of this, as appears by his own words. *The nature of the moral attributes implies neceſſarily a limitation in the uſe of them.* And why would he not ſuppoſe Divines might ſee as far into this matter as himſelf?

But if there be an error in *artificial Theology* he is as ſure to eſpouſe it at one time or other, as he is, at all times, to calumniate the Divine who holds it. Men in their ill adviſed zeal to defend the Goſpel-doctrine of the Son's divinity, were not always ſufficiently careful in ſelecting their arguments. Amongſt ſuch as had, perhaps, been better let alone, they employed this, That as man's offence was againſt an infinite Being, it required an infinite ſatis-

Digitized by Google

faction; which none but ſuch a Being could give. Now it is on this very principle, we ſee, his Lordſhip goes about to diſcredit God's moral attributes, and the *artificial Theology* of Jeſus Chriſt.

As the being *bounded* is one of his Lordſhip's objections againſt the *moral attributes*, ſo another is, that ſome of them are merely HUMAN.

"After Dr. CLARKE (ſays he) has repeated over and over that all the *moral* "*attributes* are the ſame in God as in our "ideas; and that he who denies them to "be ſo may as well deny the divine *phyſical* "*attributes*, the Doctor inſiſts only on "two of the former, on thoſe of *juſtice* and "*goodneſs*. He was much in the right to "contract the generality of his aſſertion. "The abſurdity of aſcribing TEMPE-"RANCE, for inſtance, or FORTITUDE, to "God, would have been too groſs, and too "viſible even to eyes that prejudice had "blinded the moſt. But that, of aſcribing "*juſtice* and *goodneſs*, to him, according "to our notions of them, might be better "covered, and was enough for his purpoſe, "tho' NOT LESS REALLY ABSURD [15]."

[15] Vol. v. p. 311.

Had

Digitized by Google

Had not his Lordſhip accuſtomed us by his reaſoning, as well as admoniſhed us by his motto [16], *to wonder at nothing*, this paragraph were enough to ſet his readers in *admiration*: doubtful indeed of their object, whether of his KNOWLEDGE or his INGENUITY.

When men contemplate what they call moral virtue, or the attributes of humanity, they divide them into two claſſes perfectly diſtinct from one another. In the firſt are comprized thoſe which belong to man under the idea of a free intelligent Being, ſuch as *goodneſs* and *juſtice*: in the ſecond, thoſe which belong to him under the idea of a creature of that very imperfect ſpecies, ſuch as *temperance* and *fortitude*. The firſt belong to all free intelligent Beings; the latter, only to ſuch a Being as man: *Thoſe* ariſe out of the nature of free intelligence, and ſo are common to all. *Theſe*, from the imperfections of a very inferior creature, and ſo are peculiar to humanity; for we eaſily conceive higher Orders of free intelligences, amongſt whom the moral virtues of the ſecond claſs have no place. They are ſuperior to the impreſſions

[16] *Nil admirari.*

of

Digitized by Google

of fear, and ſo have no need to exert *fortitude:* They are removed from the temptation of exceſs, and ſo have no room for the exerciſe of *temperance.*

Now when CLARKE, or any other Divine, had ſaid, that *the moral attributes are the ſame in God as in our ideas,* What attributes could they poſſibly mean but thoſe of the *firſt claſs*; thoſe which belong to Beings under the idea of free intelligences? STUPID as his Lordſhip is pleaſed to make Divines, they could never *blunder* to that degree as to conceive, that thoſe virtues or *moral attributes,* which proceed from the *imperfection* of the Creature, might belong in any manner to the Creator, whom they ſuppoſed to be *all perfect.*

They held, with his Lordſhip, and they will hold without him, that the great God is *infinitely* wiſe and powerful: Were they then in any danger to give him *temperance,* which implied his being obnoxious to *folly*; or *fortitude,* which argued *impuiſance?*

Infinite wiſdom, therefore, and infinite power exclude from God the very ideas of *temperance* and *fortitude.* But do infinite wiſdom and infinite power exclude from God

Digitized by Google

God the ideas of *goodneſs* and *juſtice?* On the contrary, his Lordſhip, as we ſhall ſee preſently, is reduced to the poor ſhift of owning *goodneſs* and *juſtice* to be contained in infinite *wiſdom* and *power*. At preſent I would aſk another queſtion. What muſt his Lordſhip's admirers think of their Maſter's IPSE DIXIT, when it comes to this, *That the inſcribing goodneſs and juſtice to God is* NO LESS REALLY ABSURD *than the aſcribing temperance and fortitude to him?*

And now I might leave it to them to determine, whether this was *contracting the generality of the aſſertion to ſerve a purpoſe; the abſurdity of aſcribing temperance and fortitude to God being too groſs and too viſible to the moſt prejudiced.* For to what *purpoſe* could this *contraction*, as he calls it, *ſerve*, but to the purpoſe of COMMON SENSE? Had his Lordſhip but been pleaſed to *contract* himſelf on the ſame principle, his bulky Volumes had ſhrunk into a Pamphlet.

But then, if you aſk *what purpoſe* his Lordſhip had *to ſerve* when he uſed the equivocal word ALL, which may ſignify either *all* of one kind, or *all* of every kind, where

Digitized by Google

where he ſays, Clarke holds, *that* ALL *the moral attributes are the ſame in God*, &c. ſhould you aſk this, the anſwer is obvious. It was to give himſelf an occaſion to ſay that Clarke afterwards *contracts his generality*, or, in other words, that he contradicts himſelf.

But let us conſider this *contracted generality* a little cloſer. Dr. CLARKE aſſerts, *that goodneſs and juſtice are the ſame in God as in our ideas:* This, if we believe his Lordſhip, is downright NONSENSE and BLASPHEMY. Lord BOLINGBROKE aſſerts, *that wiſdom and power are the ſame in God as in our ideas:* And this is SENSE and PIETY. How came his Lordſhip by this knowledge concerning God's wiſdom and power? He tells us, he got it *intuitively and by the help of his ſenſes* [17]. And do we not come to the knowledge of God's goodneſs and juſtice, in the very ſame way? Or is there any other way of acquiring it? How happens it then, that, of theſe two aſſertions, ſupported on the ſelf ſame principles of knowledge, the one is *nonſenſe and blaſphemy*, and the other *ſenſe and piety?* For a reaſon worthy the *firſt philoſophy*; What-

[17] Vol. iv. p. 116.

ever

ever his Lordſhip holds in contradiction to Divines, is *ſenſe* and *piety*; and whatever Divines hold in contradiction to his Lordſhip, is *nonſenſe* and *blaſphemy*.

A third objection againſt the *moral attributes* is, "That PASSIONS and AFFECTIONS mix with our goodneſs and juſtice; which therefore cannot be ſuppoſed to be *the ſame in kind* with God's; tho' our wiſdom and power with which no paſſions or affections mix, muſt be *the ſame in kind*" with his.

Were paſſion and affection inſeparable from human goodneſs and juſtice, the objection might appear to have ſome tho' not much force, even then. But they are eaſily ſeparable: I do not mean in ſpeculation only, but in practice. The true idea of human goodneſs and juſtice excludes all paſſion and affection. What hinders then our riſing, from that idea, to divine goodneſs and juſtice, any more than our riſing, from the idea of human wiſdom and power to the divine wiſdom and power; and from perceiving that as well the *moral*, as the *natural* attributes, are the ſame in kind, both in God and man?

But,

Digitized by Google

But, this is not all that may be ſaid in favour of our adequate idea of God's *moral attributes*. For tho' paſſion mixes not with our *natural* attributes of wiſdom and power, yet ſomething elſe does, much more difficult to be ſeparated, than paſſion, from our *moral* attributes, I mean the INSTRUMENTALITY OF MATTER. We can conceive nothing of human POWER without the uſe of ſuch an inſtrument: yet this, by his Lordſhip's own confeſſion, does not hinder us from riſing from the idea of our own wiſdom and power, to the wiſdom and power of God; and from ſeeing that they are the ſame in kind.

But ſtill, further. The MANNER *of knowing* in God, on which depends his natural attribute of WISDOM, is confeſſedly different from what it is in man; and at the ſame time utterly unknown to us: yet this does not, according to his Lordſhip's account, hinder our attaining to an adequate idea of *divine wiſdom*, tho' it riſes from what we ſee of the *human*.

How happens it then, that, in both theſe caſes, notwithſtanding the foreign mixture of the *inſtrumentality of matter*, and

Digitized by Google

and the *manner of knowing*, we attain an adequate idea of God's wiſdom and power? His Lordſhip will tell you, it is by ſeparating that mixture from our ideas of wiſdom and power. And ſhall I not have as much credit with you, when I tell you we acquire an adequate idea of God's goodneſs and juſtice, by ſeparating from the idea of human goodneſs and juſtice the foreign mixture of *paſſion* and *affection*? You muſt admit both our aſſertions; or you muſt reject both. And when I ſay You, I mean every fair and ingenuous man like You; who having nothing to fear, and a great deal to hope from Religion, are, I think, the ableſt judges of it's truth. For HOPE encourages men to *ſearch* into the grounds of what Religion promiſes; but FEAR always deters them from giving much *attention* to what it threatens.

But his Lordſhip has a greater quarrel than all this, with the *moral attributes*. They are productive, he ſays, of much *miſchief*, by bringing in embarraſſed queſtions into Religion.

" As they [the Divines] modeled God's " government on a human plan, ſo they " conceived his perfections, *moral* as well " phyſical

" phyſical, by human ideas — Thus God " was ſaid to be the FIRST GOOD: but " then the general notion or abſtract idea " of this *good* was not only taken from " human goodneſs, but was conſidered too " with little or no other relation than to " man — A queſtion aroſe therefore on " theſe hypotheſes, *How could evil come into* " *a ſyſtem of which God was the Author?* — " this queſtion made a further hypotheſis " neceſſary; another firſt God, another " coeternal and coequal principle was in- " troduced to ſolve it; *a firſt cauſe of all* " *evil*, as the other was *of all good* [18]."

The falſe repreſentation of this fact I reſerve for another occaſion: the falſe inference from it is what I now propoſe to examine.

His Lordſhip ſuppoſes, that the principle of God's *moral attributes* gave birth to an inſolvable queſtion concerning *the origin of evil:* And that this occaſioned the invention of the miſchievous hypotheſis of the *two principles.* Who would have ſuſpected that ſo much evil could have come from the FIRST GOOD! Yet ſo it was.

[18] Vol. iv. p. 88.

And

Digitized by Google

And therefore the idea of ſuch a GOOD muſt be *falſe*, or, at leaſt, very *hurtful*.

1. As to the firſt, if his Lordſhip's inference be right, it will help to deprive us of all uſeful knowledge; becauſe there is no great principle, either in *phyſics*, or in *natural Theology*, which, if we be not on our guard and wiſe enough to ſtop at the extent of our ideas, will not lead us into inextricable difficulties.

Take an inſtance in one that ariſes out of both theſe ſciences, — *The agreement between free-will and preſcience*. I the rather chuſe this inſtance, as his Lordſhip has pretended to unty a knot, which hath ſo long kept the learned World intangled; and as one of the principal deſigns of this VIEW is to illuſtrate his Lordſhip's great talents. "Our ideas (ſays he) of di-
"vine intelligence and wiſdom may be
"neither *fantaſtical* nor *falſe*, and yet
"God's MANNER of knowing may be ſo
"different from ours, that fore-knowledge,
"as we call it *improperly in him*, may be
"conſiſtent with the contingency of events;
"altho' that which we call *properly* fore-
"knowledge *in ourſelves*, be not ſo [19]."

[19] Vol. v. p. 525.

Digitized by Google

I have two or three remarks to make on theſe words. The firſt is, that, by the very turn of the phraſe — *may be neither — and yet* — he appears conſcious of his own prevarication. Our ideas of God's *goodneſs* and *juſtice* he makes *fantaſtical* and *falſe*, on account of difficulties ariſing from them: yet God's *natural* attributes, his *intelligence and wiſdom*, *may*, he ſays, *be neither fantaſtical nor falſe*, tho' a difficulty as great ariſes from them; namely, the apparent diſcordancy between free-will and preſcience.

My ſecond remark is, that his ſolution of this difficulty is more *fantaſtic* than the wildeſt chimera of School-metaphyſics. Common-ſenſe informs us, that the difficulty, in reconciling *God's preſcience to man's free-will*, does not ariſe from our ignorance in God's MANNER OF KNOWING, but from his ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE.

My third remark is, that his Lordſhip, who is here ſo penetrating, that he can eaſily reconcile *preſcience* and *free-will*; is, in another place, ſo cloudy, that he cannot ſee how an *equal providence* and *free agency* may ſtand together.

My

Digitized by Google

My laſt remark is, and it riſes out of the foregoing, that where Religion is not concerned, his Lordſhip ſees no difficulties in any part of the ſyſtem of Creation: but as ſoon as ever Religion appears, then difficulties ſtart up by dozens.

Take now another inſtance from the caſe in hand. Our ideas of God's *moral attributes*, he ſays, muſt needs be falſe, becauſe the conceiving of them by human goodneſs and juſtice leads to the queſtion of the *origin of evil*, conſidered *morally*. Well. And does not the conceiving of God's *phyſical attributes* by human wiſdom and power lead to the queſtion of the *origin of evil* conſidered *naturally*? Yet our ideas of the phyſical attributes are neither *falſe nor fantaſtical*. But to this, his Lordſhip replies, Evil, conſidered *naturally*, is not real, but apparent only. Why ſo? Becauſe it contributes to the greater good of the whole. May not the ſame thing be ſaid of Evil, conſidered *morally*? Nay, hath it not been actually ſaid, and proved too, on the ſame principles? It follows then, that they are either both *real*, or both *fantaſtic*.

Digitized by Google

But preſumptuous man knows not when to ſtop. He would penetrate even to the Arcana of the Godhead.

« For Fools ruſh in where Angels fear to tread.

And this impious humour gave birth to the abſurd hypotheſis of TWO PRINCIPLES. But is the folly to be charged upon our idea of the *moral attributes?* Ridiculous! We ſee it's cauſe is in vanity and ſelf-conceit: paſſions that operate alike on all principles.

2. As to his Lordſhip's ſecond inference, that *this* idea is at leaſt productive of much *miſchief*; ſo that it would be better to have none at all; Let me obſerve, that the very idea of God's exiſtence is alike productive of miſchief, even all the miſchiefs of ſuperſtition. Is it therefore better to be without a God? Who, beſides his Lordſhip, would ſay ſo [20]. Why then ſhould we think it better to be without the idea of the *moral attributes*, even tho' the evils it produced were *neceſſary?* But

[20] He indeed ſays *he had rather be an Atheiſt than acknowledge the Chriſtian Theology*; and we may believe him. See Vol. iv. p. 34.

that

Digitized by Google

that is not the caſe. They are *caſual* only: the iſſue of pride and preſumption; which this idea does not at all influence.

However, theſe *moral attributes*, if not hurtful, are USELESS; and this is his next cavil. "Infinite *wiſdom* and *power* (ſays his Lordſhip) "have made things as they "are: how *goodneſs* and *juſtice* required "they ſhould be made is neither *coram* "*judice*, nor to any rational purpoſe to in-"quire [1]." To inquire how the *univerſe of things ſhould be made*, ſerves indeed *no reaſonable purpoſe*. But to inquire concerning our own ſtate and condition, is either *coram judice*, or we were ſent into the world to ſtare about us, and to judge of nothing. His Lordſhip's ſophiſtry ſeems to confound two things that common ſenſe has always diſtinguiſhed; *our own buſineſs from other men's*. When the King holds a bed of juſtice, 'tis not for every Particular to inquire into all his meaſures: But every Particular who is ſummoned to attend the Court, is much concerned to know how he himſelf ſhall be dealt with. His Lordſhip indeed, is ready to ſay, We are not ſummoned;

[1] Vol. v. p. 363.

Digitized by Google

that is, we are not *accountable creatures*. But this is begging the queſtion.

At length, he ends juſt where he ſet out, That we have NO IDEAS of the moral attributes. "Upon the whole matter we may "conclude ſafely from error, and in direct "oppoſition to CLARKE, that *goodneſs and* "*juſtice in God cannot be conceived, without* "*manifeſt preſumption and impiety, to be the* "*ſame as in the ideas we frame of theſe* "*perfections when we conſider them in men,* "*or when we reaſon about them abſtractedly* "*in themſelves*; but that in the ſupreme "Governor of the World they are ſome-"thing TRANSCENDENT, and of which we "cannot make any true judgment, nor ar-"gue with any certainty about them [2]." And in this his Lordſhip tells us he is juſtified by the authority of St. PAUL and Dr. BARROW. *Theſe two great Divines* (ſays he) *are on my ſide* [3]. Who would have thought of two ſuch honourable Supporters for his Lordſhip's Atchievements? One thing I have obſerved, which might occaſion ſome ſpeculation; A ſtrange propenſity in Free-thinkers to miſtake their enemies for their friends; and, which is more to be

[2] Vol. v. p. 359. [3] Vol. v. p. 362.

Digitized by Google

lamented, as ſtrange a propenſity in the Clergy to miſtake their friends for their enemies. The turn is odd enough on both ſides: and, at firſt view, appears a little myſterious; when, perhaps, there may be no more in it than this, — Free-thinkers have employed this trick to enflame the Clergy's jealouſy: and the Clergy have unhappily fallen into the ſnare.

But after what has paſſed, who would expect that *the leather-dreſſing Pontiff*, of all men, ſhould have been thought worthy to ſupport the *firſt Philoſophy!* What has St. PAUL done at laſt, to deſerve ſo much honour? Why, in anſwer to the objections againſt God's diſpenſations in the religious World, the Apoſtle refers us "for entire "ſatisfaction to the incomprehenſible wiſ-"dom of God, who frequently, in the "courſe of his providence, ordereth things "in methods tranſcending our abilities to "diſcover or trace [4]."

This ſolution, which is here extolled for it's great *modeſty*, is quoted in another place for it's greater IMPUDENCE [5]. It may be one or the other, juſt as his Lordſhip is in humour; who, notwithſtanding

[4] Vol. v. p. 360. [5] Vol. iii. p. 307.

Digitized by Google

his long ſtudy of LOCKE, ſeems totally to have loſt all ideas of MORAL MODES. How otherwiſe was it poſſible, after having treated all Mankind in the manner you have ſeen in my *firſt* Letter, and will further ſee in my *third*, he ſhould gravely tell his Friend, "That few men, he believes, "have CONSULTED others both *living* and "the *dead*, with LESS PRESUMPTION, and "in a GREATER SPIRIT OF DOCILITY, "than he has done [6]." I ſometimes thought a word wrong printed; and that for, *conſulted* we ſhould read, *inſulted*; for in a great man, there is no *preſumption*, whatever meanneſs there may be, in *inſulting* his inferiors. And as for his *docility* in doing it, that will hardly be diſputed; there being no Author, whom he has *inſulted* moſt, but from whom he has condeſcended to ſteal more: of which, (for want of a better at hand) I might give an inſtance in the perſon and writings of the Author of the *Divine Legation*.

But St. PAUL ſays, *we muſt have recourſe to the incomprehenſible wiſdom of God*. In good time. But how does this prove that,

[6] *Introductory Letter to Mr. Pope*, Vol iii. p. 320.

in

Digitized by Google

in Paul's opinion, we have no adequate idea of the *moral attributes?* Unleſs the *quality* of an Agent, and his *action*, be one and the ſame thing. You, Sir, have an *adequate* conception, I am ſure, of our gracious Monarch's *goodneſs* and *juſtice*; but you have a very imperfect comprehenſion of ſeveral of his State-meaſures. I have frequently attempted to illuſtrate my reaſoning on divine matters from examples in human Rulers. This is a tickliſh point. And therefore I have been very careful that thoſe *regal* acts by which I would illuſtrate the *divine*, be not ſuch as proceed from the weakneſs and imperfections of humanity. If they be, the inſtance is impertinent, and wide of the purpoſe. This was the more carefully to be obſerved, becauſe writers have carried theſe illuſtrations into much abuſe. And no body more than this Noble Lord; of whom it may be truly affirmed that, with all his negligence in writing, he has not omitted any one ſpecies of falſe reaſoning.

To proceed. Dr. BARROW, I preſume, will ſtand his Lordſhip in no better ſtead than St. *Paul.* "As the dealings of every "wiſe man (ſays the Doctor) are ſome-

"times

Digitized by Google

" times founded upon maxims, and admit " juſtifications not obvious or penetrable by " vulgar conceit, ſo may God act accord- " ing to rules of wiſdom and juſtice, which " it may be quite impoſſible by our facul- " ties to apprehend, or with our means to " deſcry. As there are natural modes of " Being and operation, ſo there may be pru- " dential and moral modes of proceeding, " far above our reach, peculiar objects of " divine wiſdom not to be underſtood by " any creature, eſpecially by creatures who " ſtand in the loweſt form of intelligence; " one remove from beaſts. In fine, thoſe " rules of equity and experience which we " in our tranſactions with one another do " uſe, if they be applied to the dealings of " God will be found very incongruous or " deficient, the caſe being vaſtly altered " from that infinite diſtance in nature and " ſtate between God and us, and from " the immenſe difference which his rela- " tions towards us have from our relations " to one another [7]."

What now has all this, which relates only to the *incomprehenſible nature of God's providence*, to do with our *inadequate ideas*

[7] Vol. v. p. 361, 2.

of

Digitized by Google

of his moral attributes? At leaſt, if his Lordſhip will contend, that the man who thinks God's providence *incomprehenſible*, muſt needs think our ideas of his moral attributes *inadequate*; he muſt go a ſtep further; and confeſs, that *Barrow* ſuppoſed our ideas of the *natural* attributes to be *inadequate* likewiſe; for he puts both on the ſame footing. *As there are* NATURAL *modes of Being and operation,* (ſays the Doctor) *ſo there may be prudential and* MORAL *modes of proceeding far above our reach.* But as this would be going too far, farther than the *firſt Philoſophy* will allow of, I ſuppoſe he would be content to admit this quotation from *Barrow* to be nothing to the purpoſe.

At laſt, and when you would leaſt expect it, Common-ſenſe and Common-ſentiments return. And God's *moral attributes*, after much ado, are allowed to be in Nature. "Where Religions (ſays his "Lordſhip) which pretend to be revealed, "prevail, a new character of God's *good-*"*neſs* ariſes — an *artificial* goodneſs which "ſtands often in the place of the NATU-"RAL [8]." And this, after having ſo often told us that we have no adequate

[8] Vol. v. p. 431.

idea

Digitized by Google

idea of God's goodneſs by *nature*. It comes ſcantily indeed; and, in every ſenſe, *a poſteriori*: However, it comes, and deſerves to be welcomed. "All the know-"ledge (ſays he) that God has given us the "means to acquire, and therefore all he "deſigned we ſhould have of his phyſical "and MORAL nature and attributes, is "derived from *his works*, and from the "TENOUR OF THAT PROVIDENCE by "which he governs them [9]."

You will obſerve the words — *the tenour of that providence* — I have detected the ſophiſtry of them in my previous obſervation, at the entrance on the argument, where I have ſtated the meaning of the terms, *God's works*. I bid you obſerve them now, to judge of the following *climax*, if I may ſo call it, or *walk down ſtairs*. "The *wiſdom* is not ſo often diſ-"cernible by us [in God's works] as the "*power* of God, nor the *goodneſs* as the "wiſdom [10]."

As cautious as his Lordſhip is here, in the ſlender allowance of God's *moral attributes* from his *works*, yet even this is a flat contradiction to what his Syſtem has oblig-

[9] Vol. v. p. 523, 4. [10] Vol. v. p. 335.

Digitized by Google

ed him over and over to affirm; as particularly in the following words --- *Of divine goodneſs and divine juſtice* (ſays his Lordſhip in the perſon of Anaxagoras) *I am unable to frame any adequate notions* [11], *from God's works.*

But, he is more free of his conceſſions in another place; tho' with a very extraordinary ſalvo.

" By natural Theology (ſays his Lord-
" ſhip) we are taught to acknowledge and
" adore the infinite *wiſdom* and *power* of
" God, which he has manifeſted to us in
" ſome degree or other in every part, even
" the moſt minute, of his Creation. By
" THAT TOO, WE ARE TAUGHT TO
" ASCRIBE GOODNESS AND JUSTICE TO
" HIM, WHETHER HE INTENDED WE
" SHOULD SO ASCRIBE THEM, that is,
" whether either his works, or the diſ-
" penſations of his providence do as *ne-*
" *ceſſarily* communicate theſe notions to
" our minds, as thoſe of wiſdom and pow-
" er are communicated to us, in the whole
" extent of both [12]."

Truly, an obſervation ariſing from the very depths of the *firſt Philoſophy*. And

[11] Vol. iv. p. 116, 17. [12] Vol. v. p. 527.

we

Digitized by Google

we learn this by it, that his Lordſhip has a very ſtrong inclination, that God ſhould have neither *goodneſs* nor *juſtice*; ſo far as they carry with them any DISPOSITION to *reward* or *puniſh*. For as to the Attributes *themſelves*, diveſted of their conſequences; and undiſturbed by our *impious imitation* [13], he has little or no quarrel with them. This may ſerve us for a Key, to decypher this portentous Ænigma, *That God may teach us by his works that he is good and juſt, and yet never intend that we ſhould learn.* His Lordſhip has, indeed, taught us many things, which he certainly never intended we ſhould learn. But to make God do the ſame, is drawing an image of the Deity from his own likeneſs, the very fault he ſo cenſures in Divines. But if God muſt needs be repreſented either after Them, or after his Lordſhip; I ſhould chuſe to have the Clergy's God, tho' made out of no better ſtuff than ARTIFICIAL THEOLOGY, becauſe that gives him *goodneſs* and *juſtice*; rather than his Lordſhip's God which has neither; altho' compoſed of the more refined mate-

[13] *Our obligation to imitate God is a falſe and profane Doctrine.* Vol. v. p. 65.

rials

Digitized by Google

rials of the FIRST PHILOSOPHY. In the mean time, I will not deny but He may be right in what he ſays, That men conceive of the Deity, *more humano*; and that his Lordſhip's God and the Clergy's God, are equally faithful copies of themſelves.

But tho' he affirms here, that the Conſtitution of things may be ſo framed as to *teach* us to aſcribe goodneſs and juſtice to God, without his *intending* we ſhould ſo aſcribe them; yet, in another place, quoted once already, he makes this very Conſtitution of things a *proof* that God did *intend* it. "It is ſufficient to eſtabliſh our moral obli-"gations, that we conſider them relatively "to our own ſyſtem. From thence they "ariſe; and SINCE THEY ARISE FROM "THENCE, IT MUST BE THE WILL OF "THAT BEING who made the ſyſtem that "we ſhould obſerve and practiſe them "[13]."

However he gives a reaſon for his doubt, whether God *intended we ſhould learn* what his WORKS teach us. It is becauſe he doubts *whether the ideas of goodneſs and juſtice follow as neceſſarily from his works, and the* DISPENSATIONS OF HIS PROVI-

[13] Vol. v. p. 452.

DENCE

Digitized by Google

DENCE *as his power and wiſdom do.* Allow him now, his *ſecond* doubt; tho' it ſtand on nothing but his MASTER SOPHISM; yet the *firſt* will be ſtill without foundation.

If God *teaches*, whether it be done clearly or obſcurely, he certainly *intended to teach.* And what we get by the appearances, is *real* knowledge, upon his Lordſhip's own principles. For if truth be, as he aſſures us it is, of ſo precarious a nature as to take it's Being from our own ſyſtem, it muſt be *real* as far as it *appears.* "Our "knowledge (ſays this great Philoſopher) "is ſo dependent on our own ſyſtem, that "a great part of it would not be *knowledge* "perhaps, but *error* in any other [14]."

It is thus he involves himſelf in perpetual contradictions: But it is always thus, when men *diſpute* (for *believe* they cannot [15]) againſt *common notices*, and the moſt obvious truths; ſuch as *liberty of will*; the *certainty of knowledge*; and this, which, I reckon, obtrudes itſelf upon us as forcibly

[14] Vol. iii. p. 356.

[15] Hear what he himſelf ſays of FREE-WILL. *The free-will of man no one can deny he has, without* LYING, *or renouncing his intuitive knowledge.* Vol. v. p. 406.

as

Digitized by Google

as either, the MORAL ATTRIBUTES OF THE DEITY.

But the game is now on foot. Let us follow closely. We have unravelled him through all his turnings; and we may soon expect to see him take shelter in the thick cover of God's incomprehensible Nature; and rather than allow, in good earnest, the *moral attributes* of the Deity, ready to resolve all his Attributes, both *natural* and *moral*, into one INDEFINITE PERFECTION.

But soft. Not yet. We must come to it by degrees, and regular advances. First the *moral attributes* are to be *resolved* into the *natural*.

— "If they [the *natural* and *moral* attributes] "may be considered separately, as "we are apt to consider them; and if the "LATTER and every thing we ascribe to "these, are not to be RESOLVED *rather into* "*the former*; into his infinite intelligence, "wisdom, and power [16]." It is yet, we see, but a question; and that only, whether the *moral* attributes are not to be resolved into the *natural*. In the next passage it is determined. "I think (and

[16] Vol. v. p. 523, 4.

Digitized by Google

what he thinks, he holds it reaſonable all the world ſhould think too) " that the *mo-*
" *ral* attributes of the ſupreme Being are
" *abſorbed in his wiſdom*; that we ſhould
" conſider them only as different modificati-
" ons of this *phyſical* attribute [17]."

We are not yet near the top. However, before we go higher, let us ſet together his inconſiſtencies as they appear in this ſituation Sometimes *the ideas of divine wiſdom are better determined than thoſe of divine goodneſs* [18]. Sometimes *we have no ideas at all of divine goodneſs* [19]. And ſometimes again, as in the place before us, the *divine goodneſs is the ſame as wiſdom*, and therefore, doubtleſs, the idea of it as well determined. Now, of all theſe aſſertions, which will his Lordſhip ſtick by? Which, do you aſk? By none of them longer than they will ſtick by him; and ſtraggling, undiſciplined Principles, picked up at adventures, are not apt to ſtick long by any ſide. As ſoon as they begin to incline towards the enemy, he has done with them.— Come, if you will have the ſecret, take it. The attributes are mere NAMES,

[17] Vol. v. p. 335. [18] Vol. v. p. 341, 526.
[19] Vol. iv. p. 116, 17.

and

Digitized by Google

and there is an end of them. All that really remains is one undefined ETERNAL REASON: And ſo the Farce concludes.

"The moral ATTRIBUTES (ſays he) "are *barely* NAMES that we give to various "manifeſtations of the infinite wiſdom of "one *ſimple uncompounded being* [20]."

"Of divine goodneſs and divine juſtice "I am unable to frame any adequate no-"tions; and inſtead of conceiving ſuch "diſtinct moral attributes in the ſupreme "Being, *we ought, perhaps, to conceive no-"thing more than this,* that THERE ARE "VARIOUS APPLICATIONS OF ONE ETER-"NAL REASON, WHICH IT BECOMES US "LITTLE TO ANALYZE INTO ATTRI-"BUTES [1]."

To this miſerable refuge is his Lordſhip reduced, to avoid DIVINE JUSTICE. But why, you ſay, did he not ſpeak out at firſt, and end his quarrel with the *moral attributes* at once? Your humble ſervant, for that. Barefaced NATURALISM has not ſuch charms as to make her received wherever, and whenever, ſhe comes. There is need of much preparation, and more diſguiſe, before you can get her ad-

[20] Vol. v. p. 453. [1] Vol iv. p. 117.

Digitized by Google

mitted even to what is called *good company*. But now, he has reſolved to ſpeak out, Why, you aſk, does it yet ſeem to ſtick in the paſſage? And when his premiſſes are general againſt *all* attributes, his concluſion is particular againſt the *moral*? Not without cauſe, I aſſure you. He had need of the *natural* attributes, to ſet up againſt the *moral*: and therefore had himſelf actually *analyzed* this *eternal reaſon* into the ſpecific attributes of *wiſdom* and *power*. But when he ſaw his adverſaries might, by the ſame way, analyze it into *goodneſs and juſtice*, He then thought fit to pick a quarrel with his own method: but it was to be done obliquely. And hence ariſes his embarraſs and tergiverſation. He would willingly, if his Reader be ſo pleaſed, analyze the *eternal reaſon* into *wiſdom* and *power*: but there he would ſtop: and leave the other ſide of the *eternal reaſon*, unanalyzed: and if *goodneſs* and *juſtice* ſhould chance to ſtart out, he has a trick to *reſolve* and *abſorb* them into wiſdom and power, as only *different modifications of the phyſical attributes*. But if this revolts his Readers, and they expect equal meaſure; then, rather than give them back the

Digitized by Google

the *goodneſs* and *juſtice* he has been at all this pains to *aſcribe*, he will throw *wiſdom and power* after them, and *reſolve* all into the ONE ETERNAL REASON.

Baſhful NATURALISM has now thrown aſide her laſt and thinneſt vail: and is ready, we ſee, to face down her Rival; whom till now ſhe was content to counterfeit. Give me leave, therefore, to repreſs this laſt effort of her inſolence by another paſſage from the *Sermons* quoted once or twice already.

— "We have been told, and with airs of "ſuperior knowledge, that theſe pretend- "ed attributes, as they are commonly "ſpecified, and diſtinguiſhed into *natural* "and *moral*, are a mere human fiction; "invented, by aid of analogy from the "actions, paſſions, and qualities obſervable "in man: and that the ſimple nature of "Deity is one uniform perfection; of "which, Infinity being the baſe, we can "have no diſtinct idea or conception.

"To this it will be ſufficient to reply, "that it is indeed true, that theſe ſpecific "attributes, from which we deduce all "our knowledge of the nature and will of "God, are formed on analogy, and bear

Digitized by Google

" relation to ourſelves. But then we ſay " ſuch attributes are not, on that account, " the leſs real or eſſential. The light of " the SUN is not, in the orb itſelf, what " we ſee it in the RAINBOW. There " it is one candid, uniform, perfect blaze " of glory: here, we ſeparate it's Perfec- " tion in the various attributes of red, yel- " low, blue, purple and what elſe the ſubtle " optician ſo nicely diſtinguiſhes. But ſtill " the *ſolar* light is not leſs real in the Rain- " bow, where it's rays become thus un- " twiſted, and each differing thread diſ- " tinctly ſeen in its effect, than while they " remained united and incorporated with " one another in the Sun. Juſt ſo it is " with the divine Nature: it is one ſimple " undividual Perfection in the Godhead " himſelf: but when refracted and divari- " cated, in paſſing through the medium of " the human mind, it becomes power, " juſtice, mercy; which are all ſeparately " and ADEQUATELY repreſented to the " underſtanding [2]."

But, that his Lordſhip ſo frequently diſcards his own principles, I ſhould be

[2] *The principles of natural and revealed Religion, in a courſe of Sermons at Lincoln's Inn*, Vol. i. p. 57, 58.

in

Digitized by Google

in hopes he would ſubmit to this illuſtration, ſince he owns THAT WE SEE THE DEITY IN A REFLECTED, NOT IN A DIRECT LIGHT [3].

It is a *true* light then and not a *falſe* one: and the knowledge it conveys is *real*, not *fantaſtic*: For mirrors do not uſe to reflect the ſpecies of the mind's viſions, but ſubſtantial things. To turn us, therefore, from God's *attributes*, tho' the *indirect*, yet the well-defined, image of him, becauſe they diſcover ſomething to us we may not like, a HELL and a FUTURE JUDGMENT; to turn us, I ſay, to the *undefined eternal reaſon*, is doing like the french Philoſophers, who, when they quarrelled with Newton's Theory of light and colours, contrived to break the priſm, by which it was demonſtrated.

And now, Sir, to conclude my long Letter. Who is there that deſerves the name of MAN, and will not own that they are the MORAL ATTRIBUTES of the Deity which make him AMIABLE; juſt as the *natural attributes* make him revered and adorable? What is his Lordſhip's German-quarrel with the God of MOSES and PAUL, but

[3] Vol. v. p. 524.

Digitized by Google

that they have made him *unamiable*, by repreſenting him without *goodneſs* or *juſtice*? *Their God*, therefore, he expreſly tells us, *ſhall not be his God*. Well then: He has his God to make. And who would not expect to find him, when made by ſuch a Workman as his Lordſhip, a God of infinite goodneſs and juſtice. No ſuch matter: Theſe qualities come not out of his Lordſhip's hands, nor can enter into the compoſition of his God: They are *barely* NAMES *that men give to various manifeſtations of the infinite wiſdom of one ſimple uncompounded Being*. The pretended want of them in the God of the Jews afforded his Lordſhip a commodious cavil; for he had RELIGION to remove out of his way: But when he came to erect NATURALISM in it's ſtead, it had been inconvenient to give them to his own Idol.

Honeſt Plutarch, tho' a Prieſt, was as warm an enemy to PRIEST-CRAFT as his Lordſhip. He derives all the evils of Superſtition from men's not acquiring the idea of a God infinitely good and juſt. And propoſes this knowledge as the only cure for it. This is conſiſtent. But what would the ancient world have thought of their

Digitized by Google

their Philoſopher, had his remedy, after hunting for it through a hundred volumes, been a God without any goodneſs and juſtice at all.

NATURE tells us, that the thing moſt deſirable is the knowledge of a God whoſe goodneſs and juſtice gives to every man according to his works.

HIS LORDSHIP tells us, that REASON or NATURAL RELIGION diſcovers to us no ſuch God.

Now, if both ſpeak truth, How much are we indebted to REVELATION! Which, when *natural Religion* fails us, brings us to the knowledge of a God infinitely good and juſt; and gives us an *adequate* idea of thoſe attributes! And this, by his Lordſhip's own confeſſion. — *Chriſtianity*, ſays he, DISCOVERS *the love of God to man*; *his infinite* JUSTICE *and* GOODNESS [4].

Is this a bleſſing to be rejected? His Lordſhip had no room to ſay ſo, ſince the diſcovery is made in that very way, in which, upon his principles, it only could be made.

He pretends, "We have no other natural way of coming to the knowledge of God but

[4] Vol. v. p. 532.

from

Digitized by Google

from his *works*. By thoſe, *he ſays*, we gain the idea of his *phyſical attributes*; and if there be any thing in his *works* which ſeems to contradict theſe attributes, 'tis only ſeeming. For as men advance in the knowledge of nature, thoſe difficulties vaniſh. It is not ſo, he ſays, with regard to the *moral attributes*. There are ſo many *phænomena* which contradict theſe, and occaſion difficulties never to be cleared up, that they hinder us from acquiring an *adequate* idea of the *moral attributes*."

Now admitting all this to be true, for generally his Lordſhip's aſſertions are ſo extravagant, that they will not admit a ſuppoſition of their truth, tho' it be only for argument's ſake, What does it effect but this, *additional credit to Revelation?*

The *phyſical difficulties* clear up as we advance in our knowledge of *Nature*, and we advance in proportion to our diligence and application. But the *moral difficulties* never clear up, becauſe they riſe out of the *Whole Syſtem* of God's moral diſpenſation; which is involved in clouds and darkneſs, impenetrable to mortal ſight: and all the application of human wit alone will never enable us to draw the veil. The clear

proſpect

Digitized by Google

proſpect of it muſt come from another quarter. It muſt come, if it comes at all, from the Author of the Diſpenſation. Well; *Revelation* hath drawn this veil, and thereby removed the darkneſs which obſtructed our attaining an *adequate* idea of the *moral* attributes. Shall we yet ſtand out? And when we are brought hither upon his Lordſhip's own principles, aſſuredly you muſt. *Beware* (ſays he) *of a pretended revelation.* Why ſo? *Becauſe* (ſays he again) *the Religion of nature is perfect and abſolute; and therefore Revelation can teach nothing but what Religion hath already taught* [5]. Strange! Why, *Revelation* teaches the moral attributes; which you, my Lord, own, *natural Religion* does not teach — Here the dialogue breaks off; and leaves us in a riddle. Will you have the ſolution? It is ridiculous enough; as ſuch kind of things generally are. But if you have kept your good humour amidſt all theſe provocations of impiety, it may perhaps make you ſmile.

I told you before, that his Lordſhip borrowed all his reaſoning againſt Revelation, from ſuch as Tindal, Toland, Col-

[5] Vol. v. p. 544.

lins,

Digitized by Google

lins, Chubb, and Morgan. This ſolemn argument particularly, of the PERFECTION OF NATURAL RELIGION, and the ſuperſeded uſe of Revelation, he delivers to us juſt as he found it in Tindal.

Now Tindal, who held that natural Religion taught both the *moral attributes* and a *future ſtate*, had ſome pretence for ſaying that *it was perfect and abſolute*. But for his Lordſhip to ſay it after him, who holds that natural Religion taught neither *one* nor the *other*, ſhews, that either he places a very implicit faith in his Author, or expects it from his Reader.

The truth is, Lord Bolingbroke refuſed no arms againſt Revelation. So when he had drained his Authors of their Principles; to make all ſure, he adds others of his own. Little attentive to a truth of long experience, That the arguments of infidelity, which, like Cadmus's *Children of braſs*, ſpring from the *old dragon's teeth*, are always deſtroying one another, tho' aiming at a common Enemy. Buſy at this blind work he goes on puſhing his maſter Tindal's conſequences at a ſtrange rate. *If revealed Religion teaches more than natural, it muſt be falſe; if no more, it muſt*

Digitized by Google

be ſuperfluous. This is plauſible on Tindal's principles, that natural Religion has both the *moral attributes* and a *future ſtate*; but utterly abſurd on his Lordſhip's, who holds that it has neither. But the too eager purſuit of his old Adverſary, RELIGION, has led his Lordſhip into many of theſe ſcrapes.

I have now conſidered all I could find urged by the noble Writer in ſupport of his great principle of NO ADEQUATE IDEAS OF GOD'S MORAL ATTRIBUTES; on which the whole ſyſtem of NATURALISM is, and muſt be, founded. And you ſee to what this *all*, amounts. If I ſhould ſay to *juſt nothing*, I ſhall ſpeak more favourably of it than it deſerves. For it tends, as I have ſhewn you, in many inſtances, to confirm the great TRUTH it is brought to overthrow.

And now what I propoſed for the ſubject of this *ſecond* Letter is pretty well exhauſted. My *firſt* was employed in giving you a ſpecimen of his *Temper*. This undertakes to explain his *Syſtem*; and I reſerve the next for a diſplay of his marvellous *Talents*; tho' it be true, I have ſomewhat anticipated the Subject. For you cannot but have conceived already a very uncommon

Digitized by Google

mon idea of his abilities, on ſeeing him uſe TINDAL'S ARGUMENTS *againſt Revelation*, and *for the perfection of atural Religion*, along with his OWN PRINCIPLES of *no moral attributes* and *no future ſtate*. The firſt of which principles makes one entire abſurdity of all he borrows from Tindal againſt *Revelation*; and the *ſecond* takes away the very pretenſe for PERFECTION in *natural Religion*.

His Lordſhip's friend, *Swift*, has ſomewhere or other obſerved, that no ſubject in all nature but RELIGION could have advanced *Toland* and *Aſgill* into the claſs of reputable Authors. Another of his friends ſeems to think that no ſubject but RELIGION could have ſunk his Lordſhip ſo far below it; *If ever Lord Bolingbroke trifles*, (ſays Pope) *it will be when he writes on Divinity* [6].

But this is the ſtrange fate of Authors, whether with wit, or without, when they chuſe to write on certain ſubjects. For it is with Authors, as with men: Who can gueſs *which Veſſel was made for honour, and which for diſhonour?* when ſometimes, one and the ſame is made for both. Even

[6] *Pope's works*, Vol. ix. Letter xiv.

this

Digitized by Google

this choice Veſſel of the *firſt Philoſophy*, his Lordſhip's ſacred pages, may be put to very different uſes, according to the different tempers in which they may find his few Friends and the Public; like the *China Jordan* in the DUNCIAD, which one Hero piſſed into, and another carried home for his Head-piece.

I am, *&c.*

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

A

VIEW

OF

LORD BOLINGBROKE'S

PHILOSOPHY;

In Four LETTERS to a FRIEND.

LETTER the THIRD.

LONDON,
Printed for JOHN and PAUL KNAPTON,
in *Ludgate-Street.*
MDCCLV.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

AN

APOLOGY

FOR

The *Two Firſt Letters:*

Which may ſerve for

An INTRODUCTION

To the *Two Laſt.*

SOON after the publication of the two firſt of theſe Letters, I had the honour of an anonymous advertiſement, in the warmeſt terms of friendſhip lamenting the diſpleaſure, which my treatment of Lord Bolingbroke had given to that that part of the *Public*, where the Advertiſer had an opportunity of making his obſervations.

Digitized by Google

There was in this friendly notice ſo many ſure marks of the Writer's regard to the Author of the *View*; ſo much good ſenſe, elegance, and weight of Authority in the compoſition; and the whole ſo ſuperior to every thing, but the force of plain and ſimple truth, that I had as much pleaſure in the honour of the monition, as I had real pain for the occaſion.

He aſſures me I ſhall never know from whence it came: ſo that when ſuch a Writer will remain unknown, it is as fooliſh as indecent, to pretend to gueſs.

Yet I am very confident that a hand ſo friendly could never intend, by keeping itſelf out of ſight, to deprive me of the means of vindicating my conduct to him, on this occaſion. I am rather inclined to think, that he took this way, to oblige me to convey my Apology to him,

Digitized by Google

him, which he had a right to expect, thro' the hands of *that* Public, which appear to have none: and which yet, I am perſuaded, it was his principal concern, I ſhould firſt ſatisfy. For I muſt inform my Reader, that the ſevere reflexions, I am about to quote, are not ſo properly his ſentiments, as the ſentiments of thoſe he is pleaſed to call the *Public*.

They are introduced in this manner: *I am grieved to the heart to find the reception your two Letters meet with from the World.*—I am very ſure he is; and ſo, I think, muſt every good man be; more for the ſake of *that* Public than for mine. For what muſt an indifferent perſon think of a Public, by profeſſion, Chriſtians, of ſo exceeding delicacy as to be leſs ſcandalized at three or four bulky volumes of red hot Impiety, becauſe they come from a

Digitized by Google

Lord, than at the cool contempt of that inſult, in a Defender of the Religion of his Country, becauſe he may be a poor prieſt or an ignoble layman? Will not every impartial man lament with me ſo abject a condition of things, as that, where *atheiſtic principles* give leſs offence to our politeneſs, than *ill manners*; and where, in good company, you may be better received with the plague-ſore upon you, than the itch?

It vexes me (ſays the anonymous writer) *to hear ſo many poſitively deciding that the Writer muſt be——by the* SCURRILITY *and abuſe.*——The term is a little ſtrong. But the beſt is, it is one of thoſe words the *Public* think themſelves at liberty to apply indifferently, either to *ſcandalous abuſe* or to *honeſt reproof*, juſt as they happen to be diſpoſed to the Author, or the Subject. The equity of this kind of judgment, ſo readily paſſed

Digitized by Google

paſſed upon Authors, has been ſufficiently exemplified in the caſe of one much more conſiderable than the Author of the *View*. The Author of the *Divine Legation of Moſes* compoſed a book in ſupport of Revelation: and ſenſible that the novelty of his argument would give the alarm, and bring down whole bands of Anſwerers upon him, he did all he could to invite fair quarter. He publickly engaged that a candid, ingenuous Adverſary ſhould never repent him of his civility. Anſwerers, as he foreſaw, aroſe in abundance: but not one who treated him with common good manners. Of about a hundred of theſe writers, One or two, and no more, he thought fit to anſwer; and, (who can wonder?) without much ceremony. This was in the heat of controverſy; when his reſentments were freſh, and the injury aggravated

Digitized by Google

by every circumſtance of malice and *ſcurrility*. Since that time, for many years together, he has ſeen them write on, in the very manner they began; and without any other marks of reſentment, than a contemptuous ſilence. Yet for all this, he could not eſcape the character of a *ſcurrilous and abuſive* Writer. It was in vain to appeal to his provocations then, or to his forbearance ever ſince.

But to return to the Author of the *View*. He was detected, it ſeems, by his *ſcurrility and abuſe*. Surely, there muſt be ſome miſtake; and his Lordſhip's dirt is imputed to him. The Author of the *View* ſeems to be in the caſe of a Scavanger, (his enemies, I hope, will not take offence at the compariſon) who may not indeed be overclean while at ſuch kind of work; but it would be hard to impute that ſtink

to

Digitized by Google

to him, which is not of his making, but removing.

The Letters are univerſally read; and it is almoſt univerſally agreed that Lord Bolingbroke deſerved any treatment from you, both as a man perſonally ill uſed by him, and a member of that ORDER, WHICH HE HAS TREATED IN THE LIKE MANNER:—In a Law of Veſpaſian, we read, *Non oportere maledici Senatoribus; remaledici civile, faſque eſt.* And the equity of it my anonymous Friend ſeems to allow. But I will claim no benefit from the Authority of Veſpaſian, nor even from that which I more reverence, my kind Monitor's. The truth is, that nothing perſonal once entered into my thoughts while I was writing thoſe two letters. Had that been the caſe, it would rather have been the ſubject of my vanity, than reſentment. For nothing is more

glorious

Digitized by Google

glorious than for an obſcure writer of theſe dark and cold days, to find himſelf treated in the ſame manner with the greateſt and moſt famous of the golden Ages of antient and modern Literature.

——*But* (ſays the anonymous letter) *it may diſhonour a Gentleman and a Clergyman to give him that treatment he deſerved, eſpecially after his death. It is falling into the* VERY FAULT *ſo juſtly objected to him: every body would have applauded your ſelecting thoſe inſtances of his railing, arrogance, and abuſe, had not you followed his example.* — This Public then takes it for granted, that treating a licentious Writer as he deſerves, may *diſhonour a Gentleman and a Clergyman.* Here, I think, a diſtinction is to be made; where the thing concerns only the civil intereſts of particulars, a *Gentleman* has but little provocation for unuſual ſeverity of language,

Digitized by Google

language, and leſs for perſonal reflexion. But where the higheſt of our religious intereſts are attacked, the intereſts not of this man, nor of that; not of this Community, or the other; but of our common Nature itſelf; and where the People are appealed to, and invited to judge, there, I think, every *Gentleman*, who loves his Religion and his Country, ſhould take the quarrel on himſelf, and repel the inſult with all his vigour.

" When TRUTH or VIRTUE an affront
" endures,
" Th' affront is mine, my Friend, and
" ſhould be yours.

The manners of a *Clergyman*, if they are to be diſtinguiſhed from thoſe of a *Gentleman*, conſiſt in Zeal for God, and Charity towards Man. The occaſion will ſometimes call out one, ſometimes the other: they may

Digitized by Google

may be exerted ſeparately, but never at one another's expence. When they are ſo, all goes wrong, for they are made by Nature to act together for the common good: As in the caſe before us, I preſume to ſay, a zeal for God is the greateſt Charity to Man.

Now when Doctrines of that kind, which the *View of L. Bolingbroke's Philoſophy* expoſes, riſe to their extreme, not to confute them in terms either of horror or ridicule, for fear of tranſgreſſing the civil maxims of politeneſs, would be like that *Dean*, the Poet ſpeaks of, who ſcrupled to mention *Hell* before his audience at Court.

If then, amongſt the Chriſtian duties, there be, on ſome occaſions, a force to be exerted to repel the Inſulters of Religion, as well as, on others, a patience to be obſerved, in compaſſion to the ſimply

Digitized by Google

ply erroneous; and that this before us was not the time; I desire to know when that time comes? When men are sincere in their mistakes, after a diligent and candid search; when the subject is of small moment, such as the mode of discipline, the measure of conformity, or a distinction in Metaphysics; the mistaken, and even the perverse should be treated with tenderness. But when the avowed end of a Writer is the destruction of Religion in all its forms; when the means he employs, are every trick of prevarication, and ill faith, and every term of scurrility and abuse; when, to use the expression of Cicero, *est inter nos non de* terminis, *sed de* tota possessione *contentio*, Then a practised calmness, and affected management, look like betraying the cause we are intrusted to defend; or, what is almost as ill, like defending

Digitized by Google

ing it in that way which may turn moſt to our own advantage. As when, in queſtions of the greateſt moment, we comply with this *faſhionable indifference*, or flatter the *indifference* into a Virtue, while we ſhould have ſtriven to rekindle the dying ſparks of Religion by a vigorous colliſion with its more hardened Enemies.

Men who have had Chriſtianity indeed at heart have never been diſpoſed, in capital caſes like this, to ſpare or manage the Offenders. When the incomparable STILLINGFLEET undertook to expoſe the enormity of the Court of Rome, in turning the *diſpenſation of the word* into a lucrative trade, he proſecuted the controverſy with ſo much vigour of ſtyle and ſentiment as to be called by thoſe who found themſelves affected by it, *Buffoon* and *Comedian*. And of late, when a learned perſon had,

Digitized by Google

had, with juſt indignation, expoſed the horrid enormities of the *Moravian Brethren*, he received this anſwer for his pains, to be ſure, equally apt and ſatisfactory, *The ſervant of the Lord muſt not ſtrive, but be gentle unto all men; in meekneſs inſtructing thoſe who oppoſe themſelves.* Without queſtion, debauched and impious men would be much at their eaſe, when, ſecure from the reſentment of the *Magiſtrate*, they find they have nothing to fear from the indignation of the *Learned*.

But this leads me to another conſideration, which may further juſtify the Author of the *View*, in the account he has given of this atrocious Enemy of RELIGION and SOCIETY.

The Engliſh Government, ſecure in the divinity of that Religion which it hath eſtabliſhed, and jealous of that Liberty which at ſo much

Digitized by Google

much experience it hath procured, with a becoming conſciouſneſs of the ſuperiority of Truth, hath thought fit to ſuffer this, and many other writings, (tho' none ſo criminal in the *manner*,) to paſs thro' the Preſs, into the hands of the People: Writings, in which not only the Inſtitutions of poſitive and national Worſhip have been inſulted, but likewiſe thoſe very PRINCIPLES OF NATURAL RELIGION, which hitherto have been eſteemed the firſt bond of civil Society, as being thoſe only which can inforce obedience for conſcience ſake. A bond, which no Nation under heaven but our own will ever ſuffer to be publicly brought in queſtion: becauſe no Nation beſides has an equal confidence in *Truth*, and an equal Zeal for *Liberty*.

But do flagitious Writers therefore become more ſacred or reſpect-

Digitized by Google

able for this impunity? On the contrary, is there not the greater need that thoſe evils, which the Public cannot redreſs, ſhould at leaſt be oppoſed and checked by a private hand? Why do the civil Laws of all other Nations interfere to puniſh theſe offenders, but to prevent the miſchiefs their writings do amongſt the Populace? Why are not theſe Laws *put in execution* here, but from the experience, or, at leaſt, from a foreſight, that a recourſe to them has been, or may prove, injurious to public Liberty? However, the *end*, we ſee, is important, tho' *theſe means* may ſeem incommodious. Nothing is left then, but to employ others. What they are, the very caſe points out to us. The miſchief theſe Writers do amongſt the People is by their credit with them. If this credit be undeſerved, the way lies open for the Defender of Re-

Digitized by Google

ligion to leſſen it, either by tragical complaints or Ridicule. The Author of the *View* choſe the latter. He thought it more effectual; for now a days, Folly diſcredits more than Impiety: He thought it more generous; for he had no deſign of bringing in the Magiſtrate to ſecond his arguments. Nor is he one of thoſe impertinents who are for directing Authority, or think there is any need of ſuch as him,

"To virtue's work to urge the tardy Hall,
"Or goad the Prelate ſlumb'ring in his Stall.

He rather thinks it becomes him to follow their example. The Convocation, in their late addreſs to his Majeſty, *lament the depravity of our times, evidenced beyond all former examples, by the publication of writings which ſtrike at the very vitals of all Religion and ſhake the foundations of civil Government.* Yet they are ſo far

far from throwing the ſcandal on the State, or calling out upon the civil Magiſtrate, that, as if they even reſpected the ſlander of their Enemies, *they engage themſelves to his Majeſty to exert themſelves to the utmoſt, to maintain the honour of our moſt holy faith.* Let no one therefore take offence, that a private man has adventured to lend his hand to what the whole body of the Clergy has, with ſo much glory to themſelves, engaged to ſupport.

But his Lordſhip's *death* is a further objection to the manner in which he is treated. Had theſe *Eſſays* been publiſhed during his life, and had the Author of the *View* deferred his remarks upon them, in expectation of this good time, the cenſure might appear to have its weight. But what ſhall we ſay, if his Lordſhip was publicly invited to give *his Philoſophy* to

Digitized by Google

the world, by the promiſe of a ſpeedy anſwer? If a Writer's death may ſcreen his Works from the treatment they would deſerve in his life time, he has a very effectual way to ſecure both his Perſon and his Principles, from diſgrace. Yet, where this is mentioned as an aggravation, it is confeſſed that, in theſe poſthumous Works, publiſhed by his Lordſhip's direction, the Author of the *View* is abuſed in the groſſeſt terms. Now what is ſaid, to the diſcredit of a living Writer, eſpecially by one of his Lordſhip's Authority in politics and letters, might prove a ſubſtantial injury: The harm to a dead Writer is but fantaſtic.—This is only ſaid to ſhew, that, had the Author of the *View* retaliated, as he never had it in his thoughts to do, the return had been ſtill much ſhort of the provocation.

But

Digitized by Google

But He commits the VERY FAULT *objected to Lord Bolingbroke — and in ſelecting the inſtances of his railing and arrogance he follows his Lordſhip's* EXAMPLE.——This would be weighed. Lord Bolingbroke has, in the moſt contemptuous manner, reviled almoſt all the Wiſe and Virtuous of antient and modern times. He has railed at the primitive Saints, the modern Doctors, the whole body of the Chriſtian Clergy; and, in a word, the whole race of Mankind; which, ever ſince Religion came amongſt them, deſerve to be conſidered in no other light than as one great aggregate of Lunatics. He has abuſed *Moſes* and *Paul*; he has ridiculed the SON, and blaſphemed the FATHER. Here is another Writer, *who by his ſcurrility and abuſe is judged no other than*——and what has he done? *He has fallen into the ſame fault, and followed his example.*

Digitized by Google

What, has he likewiſe *railed* at all the Good, the Virtuous, and the Pious? Has he likewiſe had the *arrogance* to ſay, that the World was one great Bedlam? Has he likewiſe blaſphemed his Creator and Redeemer? Alaſs, no. Two ſuch Writers are too much for any one age! And yet, what leſs can juſtify Men in ſaying, that the Author of the *View* has *fallen into the ſame fault with Lord Bolingbroke, and followed his example?* All he has done is occaſionally telling the World, That his Lordſhip, once in his life, was for bringing in *Popery* and the *Pretender*; and is now for introducing *Naturaliſm*, a more ſpecious form of Atheiſm: that he is overrun with paſſion and prejudice: that he underſtands little or nothing of the ſubjects he handles, which yet he treats with ſovereign contempt: that his learning is ſuperficial, his reaſoning ſophi-

Digitized by Google

ſophiſtical, and his declamation inflated: and that, if ever Religion ſhould happen to regain its hold on the People, his *Philoſophic* works will run the hazard of being applied to the loweſt and *vileſt uſes*. This is the ſubſtance of what he has ſaid. And if this be falling into the *ſame fault, and following his Lordſhip's example*, the Author of the *View*, for ought I can perceive, muſt be content to plead guilty.

But we will ſuppoſe, the *manner* of writing, and not the *ſubject* of the Work, is here to be underſtood. Is the railing at all mankind, at all Religion, at God Almighty himſelf, but of the ſame ſpecies of writing with His, who ſhall tell the world, that this Railer was once as much an Enemy to the *Civil*, as now to the *Religious* Conſtitution of his Country; that he reaſons ill, and that he declaims worſe? Did the

Digitized by Google

politeneſs of a *Gentleman* or a *Clergyman* require, under pain of being matched with his Lordſhip in *railing* and *arrogance*, that, after the Author of the *View* had quoted all his Lordſhip's horrors in *principle* and *expreſſion*, he ſhould have added, "This, good People, is the "FIRST PHILOSOPHY, which is to "be ſubſtituted amongſt us, in the "place of RELIGION. But take "me along with you; Tho' this, "indeed, be the bane and poiſon "of your HOPES; tho' it reduce "humanity to the moſt diſconſo-"late and forlorn condition, by de-"priving it of the MORAL Ruler of "the World, and by diſſolving all "the ties of CIVIL Government; "Yet, Courage! The Author was a "man of diſtinguiſhed quality, of "uncommon abilities, and of infi-"nite politeneſs. His great talents "for *Buſineſs* enabled him to ſee

"what

Digitized by Google

" what was beſt for Society; his
" penetration into *Philoſophic* mat-
" ters, what was beſt for human
" Nature; and his profound know-
" ledge of *Divinity*, what was beſt
" for Both. He had governed
" States; he had inſtructed Kings;
" and this laſt great Book of Wiſ-
" dom was the reſult of all his ſkill
" and experience."

All this, indeed, I might have ſaid: and, it is probable, a good deal of it I ſhould have ſaid, had the aim of my *View* been to recommend myſelf, and to raiſe a reputation from the defeat of this mighty Man. Had this, I ſay, been my aim, the raiſing the character of an adverſary who was preſently to fall by my hand, would hardly have been amongſt the laſt of my contrivances. But as I had another purpoſe, the preventing the miſchiefs of his Book, I took the different method

Digitized by Google

method of reducing his Authority its to juſt value; which, by having been over-rated, had prepared the way for the eaſy reception of his Opinions amongſt a corrupt People.

The Letters, ſay *this* Public, (whoſe ſentiments have been ſo kindly conveyed unto me) *purport to be a View of Lord Bolingbroke's Philoſophy. They are a view of his life, morals, politics, and converſation. It may be true and juſt. But that is not the queſtion. Whether he made a good treaty, or wrote the Craftſman, neither concludes for, nor againſt, the divinity of the Chriſtian Religion.*

I readily confeſs, had Lord Bolingbroke's *Morals* and *Politics* nothing to do with his *religious Principles*, I had acted both an invidious and an idle part to bring in his *Treaties* and his *Craftſmen* into a *View of his Philoſophy*. But I held all theſe

to

Digitized by Google

to be the various parts of the ſame Syſtem, which had contributed, in ſupport of one another, to produce a Whole.—I can believe he found it for his eaſe in retirement, to adhere ſtill *cloſer* to a ſet of Principles, which having facilitated his Practice, enabled him to bear the retroſpect of it: but I am much miſtaken if he did not begin the World with his notions of *God* and the *Soul*; hence his rounds of buſineſs and amuſements.

" Now all for pleaſure; now for Church and
" State.

The reſt followed in courſe. For, as Tully obſerves, *Cum enim* DECRETUM *proditur, Lex veri rectique proditur: quo a vitio et* AMICITIARUM *proditiones, et* RERUM PUBLICARUM, *naſci ſolent.*

But this is not all. I beg leave to ſay, there was not only a *cloſe*

Digitized by Google

connexion between his Principles and his Practice, but that it was neceſſary to a juſt defence of Religion againſt him, to *take notice* of that connexion.

One of his Lordſhip's pretended purpoſes, in his Philoſophic *Eſſays*, was to detect the Corruptions which the CLERGY have brought into the Chriſtian Religion: My aim, in the *View*, was to expoſe a ſpecies of Impiety which overturns all Religion.

Conſider, how his Lordſhip proceeded.——Not that I place my juſtification on his example: that, indeed, would be confirming the charge I am here endeavouring to refute; neither would I inſiſt upon the right of retaliation; for, tho' that be a better plea, it is the laſt which a Writer for Truth would have recourſe to. I quote his Lordſhip's method, as that which right reaſon preſcribes to all, who undertake to

Digitized by Google

detect and lay open error and deceit.

His Lordſhip's point, as we ſaid, was to ſhew, that the Clergy had corrupted the purity and ſimplicity of Religion. It is not my purpoſe here to inquire with what ingenuity he has repreſented the Fact, or how juſtly he has deduced the Conſequences, which, he pretends, have riſen from it. He has ſhewn ſome corruptions; he has imagined more; and dreſſed up the reſt of his catalogue out of his own invention; all which, he moſt unreaſonably offers as a legitimate prejudice againſt Religion itſelf. Well, be it ſo, that the Clergy are convicted of abuſe and impoſture. The queſtion, which every one is ready to aſk, who thinks himſelf concerned to enquire into the truth of the fact, is, CUI BONO? What end had the Clergy to ſerve by theſe corruptions? His Lordſhip thinks

thinks the queſtion reaſonable, and is as ready to reply, That they had a wicked antichriſtian Tyranny to impoſe upon the necks of Mankind: in order to which, they contrived to introduce ſuch kind of corruptions into Religion as beſt tended to pervert men's underſtandings, to intimidate their wills, and to impreſs upon their conſciences, an awe and reverence for their ſpiritual Maſters. The anſwer is ſatisfactory, and ſhews the uſe of this method in detecting error. With his rhetorical exaggerations, with the extenſion of his liſt of corruptions, with his ridiculous inferences, I have, at preſent, no concern.

Now, as the Author of the *Eſſays* had a tyrannical Hierarchy to unmaſk; ſo, the Author of the *Views* had a declared, an impious, an outrageous Enemy of all Religion to expoſe. His Lordſhip had publicly

and

Digitized by Google

and openly, in his reſpectable Character of a NOBLEMAN, a STATESMAN, and a PHILOSOPHER, declared it to be all a Cheat, ſupported only by Knaves and Madmen; which indeed was a large Party, ſince, by his own account, it takes in the whole body of Mankind. His Lordſhip had been held up to the People as an *all accompliſhed* Perſonage, full and complete in every endowment of civil and moral Wiſdom: And the enchanting vehicle in which his triumphant character was conveyed, had made it received, even againſt the information of their ſenſes. Now a Public thus prejudiced, would, on ſuch a repreſentation of his Lordſhip's religious principles as the *Eſſays* contain, and the *View* collects together, be ready to aſk "could ſo ſublime a Genius be diſpoſed to deprive himſelf, and us, of all thoſe bleſſings which Religion promiſes, had

had he not diſcovered, and been perfectly aſſured, that the whole was a deluſion; and therefore in pity to Mankind, had broke the Charm, which kept them from ſeeing their *preſent good*, in fond expectation of a recompence in the ſhadowy regions of *futurity*? We ſay, *deprive himſelf*; for he ſeems ſufficiently vext, and ſenſible of his diſappointment, when waked from the pleaſing dream of a life to come. *There is no one thought* (ſays his Lordſhip) *which ſooths my mind like this: I encourage my* IMAGINATION *to purſue it, and am heartily afflicted when* ANOTHER FACULTY *of the intellect comes boiſterouſly in, and* WAKES *me from ſo pleaſing a dream, if it be a dream*[1]."—In this manner I ſuppoſed, that they, for whoſe uſe the *View* was intended, were diſpoſed to argue; I mean that part

[1] xliii Letter to Swift in Pope's Works Vol. ix.

of

Digitized by Google

of them who yet retain any concern for another life; and who have not thrown off, together with their Guides, all thoughts of their journey thither. Now, againſt ſo dangerous a prejudice, the Defender of Religion was to provide. He was firſt to remove their deluſion concerning Lord Bolingbroke's Philoſophic Character; and to ſhew, that he had none of thoſe talents of Reaſoning, Learning, or Philoſophy which are neceſſary to qualify a man in deciding on this important queſtion. But this oppoſed only one half of their prejudices. They could by no means be brought to think that ſo good a Man, ſo benevolent a Citizen, ſo warm a friend to Mankind, as his Lordſhip's *Eſſays* repreſent him, could be lightly willing to forego that great bond of Society, that great ſupport of humanity, RELIGION. The advocate

Digitized by Google

of Religion therefore, unleſs he would betray his cauſe, was obliged to ſhew, that the Social light, in which his Lordſhip puts himſelf, and in which he had been placed by his poetical Friend, was a falſe one; that his moral virtues were an exact tally to his religious principles; and *public* virtue (according to his favorite *Cicero)* embracing and comprehending all the private, *omnes omnium Charitates* PATRIA *una complexa eſt*, it was to the purpoſe of ſuch a defence, to ſhew, that his Lordſhip had been a BAD CITIZEN. Now tho' Religion has the ſtrongeſt allurements for the Good and Virtuous, it has its terrors, and thoſe very dreadful too, for the Wicked: Who, in ſuch circumſtances, have but this for their relief, Either to part with their Vices, or their Religion. All the world knows His Lordſhip's choice. He himſelf tells us, it was made

Digitized by Google

made on the conviction of Reaſon; others think, by the inducement of his Paſſions. The World is to determine; but they ſhould judge with a knowledge of the caſe. And this, the Author of the *View* preſented to them, in anſwer to the latter part of theſe popular prejudices; which would not ſuffer them to conceive any other cauſe but rational conviction, that could induce any man in his ſenſes to part with the *ſoothing* conſolation of futurity, as his Lordſhip is pleaſed to call it.

And now, I ſuppoſe, every candid Reader will allow, at leaſt I am ſure the candid Writer of the anonymous Letter will allow, that his Lordſhip's *morals* and *politics* come within the *view of his Philoſophy*; where the queſtion is of the TRUTH or FALSHOOD of Religion; and of his Lordſhip's AUTHORITY concerning it.

To ſum up this Argument: His Lordſhip deſcants on *Romiſh Superſtition*; the Author of the *View*, on *his Lordſhip's Philoſophy*: Not to ſhew for what *end* the one was eſtabliſhed, or by what cauſes the other was produced, is relating Facts without head or tail; which the Writer on *the uſe of hiſtory* juſtly throws into the claſs of unprofitable things: and therefore his Lordſhip, ſpeaking of the corruptions brought by the Clergy, into religion, accounts for them by a ſpirit of Dominion; and the Author of the *View* ſpeaking of his Lordſhip's *religious principles*, reminds the Reader of his *moral practice*; but ſo far only as was to the purpoſe, and was notorious to all mankind.

Lord Bolingbroke (ſays this Public) *deſerved every thing of you; but who are thoſe friends and admirers of his, whom you repreſent applauding all he wrote; whom you bring in unneceſſa-*

Digitized by Google

rily upon many occaſions. I dare ſay, they are very few. You had better have named them.

As exceptionable as that, perhaps, might have been, I ſhould certainly have choſe to do ſo, had I conceived it poſſible for the Reader to underſtand, by ſuch *friends and admirers*, any of thoſe few illuſtrious Perſons, whom Lord Bolingbroke's politeneſs, his diſtance from buſineſs, his knowledge of the world, and, above all, his ambition to be admired, occaſionally brought into his acquaintance; and who gave dignity and reputation to his retirement. Several of theſe, I have the honour to know, and the pleaſure of being able to inform thoſe who do not, that they were ſo far from being in the principles of his *Philoſophy*, that ſome of them did not ſo much as know what they were; and thoſe who did, let him underſtand, how much they deteſted them,

Digitized by Google

Which very well explains the diſpoſition of his Will concerning thoſe papers, in which his *Philoſophy* is contained. And if it was no more than for the ſake of this fair opportunity of explaining myſelf, I could readily excuſe all the hard thoughts *this public* ſeems to have entertained of me. As to the *friends and admirers, who applauded all he wrote*, I meant thoſe who perſuaded him to change his mind, and give thoſe *Eſſays* to the Public, which he had over and over declared were only for the ſecret inſpection of a Few. And he ſeems willing the World ſhould know to whom it was indebted for this benefit, by his letting thoſe places in his *Eſſays* ſtand, where he declares his own opinion of their *unfitneſs* for general communication.

But what grieves and hurts your friends moſt (ſays this Public) *is ſtill behind. Poor Pope did not deſerve*

Digitized by Google

to be treated by you with ſo much cruelty, contempt, and injuſtice. In a work where Lord Bolingbroke is repreſented as a Monſter, hated both of God and Man, why is Pope always and unneceſſarily brought in, only as his friend and admirer? Why as approving of, and privy to all that was addreſſed to him? Why ſhould he, who had many great talents, and amiable qualities, be deſcribed only by the ſlighting Epithets of tuneful *and* poetical —: *You ſay, Pope* announced the glad tidings of all theſe things. *In what work can he be ſaid to have done it, except in his* Eſſay on Man? *This is throwing a reflexion on the excellent* Commentary *on that* Eſſay.

Who it was that *treated poor Pope with cruelty, contempt, and injuſtice,* Lord Bolingbroke, or the Author of the *View*, let my Cenſurers judge; and, by their freedom from paſſion and reſentment, at a time when a

Digitized by Google

friend would be moſt *hurt*, they appear perfectly qualified to judge impartially.

When, on his publication of the *Patriot King*, Lord Bolingbroke did indeed uſe the memory of poor Pope, with exceeding *contempt*, *cruelty*, *and injuſtice*, by repreſenting him, in the *Advertiſement* to the Public, as a buſy, ignorant interpolator of his works, a mercenary betrayer of his truſt, a miſerable, who bartered all the friendſhip of his Philoſopher and Guide, for a little paltry gain, Who was it then that manifeſted his *hurt and grief for poor Pope?* Was it *this Public?* Or was it the *Author of the Letter to Lord Bolingbroke on that occaſion?*

But in what conſiſts the *contempt*, *cruelty*, *and injuſtice* of the *View?* The *contempt* is in the *ſlighting epithets of tuneful and poetical:* the *Cruelty* in giving inſtances of Pope's unbound-

Digitized by Google

unbounded admiration of Lord Bolingbroke; and the *injuſtice* in ſaying that he denounced the *glad tidings of the firſt Philoſophy*, and that he approved and was *privy to all that was addreſſed to him*.

My uſing the epithets of *tuneful and poetical*, in ſpeaking of a man who had many ſuperior qualities, was, I humbly conceive, well ſuited to the occaſion. It is where I ſpeak of Pope as an idolatrous admirer of Lord Bolingbroke: and they aptly inſinuate what I would have them mean, that, Judgment had there nothing to do; but all was to be placed to the friendly extravagance of a poetical *imagination*. Who could fairly gather more from it, than that my intention was to place his Lordſhip's *gratitude*, and Mr. Pope's *idolatry* ſide by ſide, in order to their ſetting off one another. But *cruelty* is added to contempt, in the *inſtances* I give of Pope's unbounded

Digitized by Google

bounded admiration. I am verily perſuaded, had Pope lived to ſee Lord Bolingbroke's returns of friendſhip, as well in his Lordſhip's uſual converſation, as in the *advertiſement to the Patriot King*, he would have been amongſt the firſt to have laughed at his own deluſions, when this treatment of him had once broken and diſſolved the charm; at leaſt, he would have been ready to laugh with a friend, who ſhould chuſe to turn them into ridicule. For he held this to be amongſt the offices of friendſhip, to laugh at your friend's foibles till you brought him to laugh with you,

"Laugh at your Friends; and if your Friends
"be ſore,
"So much the better, you may laugh the
"more.

as implying, that, while they continued *ſore*, they continued to ſtand in need of this friendly ſurgery.

Digitized by Google

My *injuſtice* conſiſts in ſuppoſing *Pope was privy to all that was addreſſed to him.* A great injuſtice indeed, had I ſo inſinuated, I, who with greater certainty than moſt men, can affirm, that he was privy to nothing of the ſecret, but the deſign of the addreſs, and the preliminary diſcourſes. So little did Pope know of the principles of the *firſt Philoſophy*, that when a common acquaintance, in his laſt illneſs, chanced to tell him of a late converſation with Lord Bolingbroke, in which his Lordſhip took occaſion to deny God's moral attributes, as they are commonly underſtood, he was ſo ſhocked that he reſted not till he had aſked Lord Bolingbroke whether his informer was not miſtaken? His Lordſhip aſſured him, he was; of which, Pope with great ſatisfaction informed his Friend. Under this ignorance of his Lordſhip's real ſentiments it was, that

Digitized by Google

that Pope gave eaſy credit to him, when he vapoured, that *he would demonſtrate all the common Metaphyſics to be wicked and abominable* [2]. Which leads me to that part of the charge, where it is ſaid, I could only mean the ESSAY ON MAN, by the *glad tidings of the firſt Philoſophy*. I meant a very different thing; and alluded to the following paſſages in his LETTERS. *Do not laugh at my gravity, but permit me to wear the beard of a Philoſopher, till I pull it off, and make a jeſt of it myſelf. 'Tis juſt what my Lord Bolingbroke is doing with* METAPHYSICS. *I hope you will live to ſee, and ſtare at the learned figure he will make on the ſame ſhelf with Locke and Malebranche* [3]. And again, *Lord Bolingbroke is voluminous, but he is voluminous only to deſtroy Volumes. I ſhall not live, I fear, to ſee that work printed* [4]. Where,

[2] *Bolingbroke to Swift*, Letter xlviii. Vol. ix.
[3] Letters lxxi. Vol. ix. [4] Letter lxxiii.

by

Digitized by Google

by the way, his fancy that theſe METAPHYSICS were deſigned for the public, ſhews he knew nothing of the contents. This then was what I meant: The *Eſſay on Man* I could not mean. For in the 80th page of the *View*, I make the fundamental doctrines of that *Poem* and his Lordſhip's *Eſſays* to be directly oppoſite to one another. "*Mr.* POPE's *Eſ-*
"*ſay on Man* is a real vindication of
"Providence againſt Libertines and
"Atheiſts—Lord BOLINGBROKE's
"*Eſſays* are a pretended vindication
"of Providence againſt an imagina-
"ry confederacy between Divines and
"Atheiſts—The Poet directs his
"Argument againſt Atheiſts and
"Libertines in ſupport of RELIGION;
"The Philoſopher againſt Divines
"in ſupport of NATURALISM: and
"the ſucceſs is anſwerable. Pope's
"argument is manly, ſyſtematical,
"and convincing: Lord Boling-
broke's

" broke's, confuſed, prevaricating, " and inconſiſtent."

Thus I have explained, in the beſt way I am able, my reaſons for ſpeaking of Pope in a manner which gives offence. But what ſhall we ſay, if this air of negligence to his memory was aſſumed, the better to conceal the Author of an anonymous Epiſtle? The motive ſure was allowable; tho' the project was without effect: for *this Public* has poſitively decided, that *the Author muſt be — by the ſcurrility and abuſe.*

But, continues the Cenſurer, *Had you purſued the advantage you have ingeniouſly taken from an expreſſion in one of Pope's Letters, to have ſhewn that Pope differed from Bolingbroke where he was in the wrong; that he not only condemned but deſpiſed the futility of his reaſoning againſt Revelation; that where he was right Pope improved but never ſervilely copied his*

Digitized by Google

his Ideas, you would have done honour to your Friend and yourſelf: you would have ſerved the cauſe of Religion: you would have diſcredited Lord Bolingbroke the more by the contraſt——

Now all this, in the *fourth Letter*, I have done: And the Reader will find it in its place. In the mean time, every body might ſee I was ready, on a fit occaſion, to do it, by the paſſage quoted juſt above, from the *ſecond*, where *Pope is honoured, and Lord Bolingbroke the more diſcredited by the contraſt.*

But I muſt not leave this head without taking notice of one expreſſion in the cenſure. It is ſaid, that the *View* REPRESENTS *L. Bolingbroke as a Monſter hated both of God and Man.* The expreſſion had been juſter, if, inſtead of this, the writer had ſaid, *from the View it may be collected*; becauſe, whatever ideas

Digitized by Google

Ideas of his Lordſhip may ariſe in men's minds on a peruſal of the *View*, they ariſe from his Lordſhip's own words, which are faithfully quoted: What the Author of the *View* adds, is only a little wholeſome raillery, which can preſent the Reader with no idea but what (in the opinion of *Pope*) ariſes from every fruitleſs attempt of Impiety.

" Heav'n ſtill with *laughter* the vain toil
" ſurveys,
" And buries madmen in the heaps they raiſe.

That the Author of the *View* aſſiſted in the dreſſing up ſo ſtrange a ſight, as *a Monſter hated both by God and Man*, was very far from his intention. He made a ſcruple of accompanying his Lordſhip's quotations with thoſe reflexions of ſerious indignation which ſuch a Scene of horrors naturally ſuggeſt, leſt he ſhould be thought to aim at ſomething more than critical animadverſion.

Digitized by Google

verſion. He therefore generouſly endeavoured to turn the public attention from the *horror*, to the *ridicule*, of the *firſt Philoſophy*, and to get his Lordſhip well laughed at, as being perſuaded that when the Public is brought to that temper, its reſentment ſeldom riſes to extremes.

Men had better ſpeak out, and ſay, the Author of the *View* ought to have repreſented L. Bolingbroke as neither *deteſtable*, nor *ridiculous*. He could have wiſhed, that his ſenſe of honour and duty would have permitted him ſo to do. The Author of the *View* is no Fanatic or Enthuſiaſt, and perhaps leſs of a Bigot than either. Yet there are times and occaſions when the ſobereſt thinker will confeſs, that the intereſts of Particulars ſhould give way to thoſe of the Public. It is true, there are others, when politeneſs, civil prudence, and the pri-

Digitized by Google

vate motives of Friendſhip, ought to determine a man, who is to live in the world, to comply with the ſtate and condition of the times; and even to chuſe the worſe, inſtead of the better method of doing good. But my misfortune was that this did not appear to be one of thoſe occaſions, in which, when I had explained the Doctrines and Opinions of an erroneous Writer, I could leave them with this reflexion: "Theſe are the "writer's notions on the moſt im- "portant points which regard hu- "man happineſs. They are indeed "very ſingular and novel. But then "conſider, the Writer was a great "man, and high in all the attain- "ments of Wiſdom; therefore weigh "well and reverendly, before you "condemn what I have here expoſed "to your Judgment." But had I ſaid this, would it have ſecured me from OFFENCE? The thing of all, to be moſt dreaded by thoſe who know

the

Digitized by Google

the world. Would it not rather have furniſhed *another* handle to the ſame Cenſurers, of making me a confederate in his guilt, only a little better diſguiſed. This would not have been the firſt time I had been ſo ſerved, when endeavouring to avoid offence.

And yet there was but one of theſe three ways; either to laugh, to declaim, or to ſay nothing. I choſe the *firſt*, as what I fancied leaſt obnoxious; in which, however, I was miſtaken; —and as moſt likely to do good; in which, I hope, I am not miſtaken.

The only harm L. Bolingbroke can do, whoſe reputation of parts and wiſdom had been raiſed ſo high, is amongſt the PEOPLE. His objections againſt Religion are altogether of the popular kind, as we feel by the effects they have had, when uſed by their original Authors, long

Digitized by Google

before his Lordſhip honored them with a place in his *Eſſays*. What then was he to do, whoſe buſineſs it was to put a ſpeedy ſtop to the miſchief, and neither to palliate the doctrines, nor to compliment the Author of them, but to give a true and ſuccinct repreſentation of his *Syſtem*, in a popular way; to make a right uſe of that abundance, which the ESSAYS and FRAGMENTS afforded, to ſhew that his Lordſhip's *Principles* were as fooliſh as they were wicked; and that the *arguments* uſed in ſupport of them were as weak as they were bold and overbearing: that he was a pretender in matters of Learning and Philoſophy; and knew juſt as much of the genius of the Goſpel, as of that pretended corruption of it, which he calls, *artificial Theology*. This I imagined the only way to reach his Lordſhip's AUTHORITY, on which all

Digitized by Google

all depended; and then the very weakeſt effort of ridicule would be able to do the reſt. Theſe were my motives for the method I took; and whatever impropriety there may be in divulging them in a way that tends to defeat their end, it ſhould, I think, be laid to the account of thoſe who made this explanation neceſſary.

I have been the longer on this matter as it will ſerve for an anſwer to what follows.

Lord Bolingbroke (ſays this Public) *is ſo univerſally and ſo juſtly obnoxious to all ſorts and ranks of people, that, from regard to him, no body cares how he is treated, but be aſſured your manner has deſtroyed all the merit of the work.*----To the *manner* I have ſaid enough. The candid Reader, I am ſure, will allow me to add a word or two *Concerning the effect of an unacceptable manner, in a work of public ſervice.* It had, till of late,

Digitized by Google

been always esteemed matter of merit to do a general good, tho' the *manner* of doing it might not be so readily approved. But we are now become so delicate and fastidious, that it is the *manner of doing*, even in things of the highest importance, which carries away all the praise. And yet, this false delicacy on a question of no less moment than Whether we shall have any Religion or none at all, seems as ridiculous, as it would be in a Great man to take offence at an officious neighbour for saving his falling Palace, by a few homely props near at hand, when he should have considered of a support more conformable to the taste and general style of Architecture, in my Lord's superb piece; or to find him disconcerted by that charitable hand, which should venture to pull his Grandeur by head and shoulders out of his flaming apartment.

But

But in theſe ſuppoſitions I grant much more than in reaſon I ought. I ſuppoſe the public taſte, which the *manner* in queſtion has offended, is founded in Nature; whereas 'tis the creature of Faſhion, and as ſhifting and fantaſtic as its Parent. TRUTH, which makes the *matter* of every honeſt man's enquiry, is eternal; but the *manner ſuited to the public taſte*, is nothing elſe than conformity to our preſent paſſions, or ſentiments; our prejudices, or diſpoſitions. When the truths or the practices of Religion have got poſſeſſion of a People, then a warmth for its intereſts, and an abhorrence of its Enemies, become the public taſte; and men expect to find the zeal of an Apoſtle in every defender of Religion: But when this awful Power has loſt its hold, when, at beſt, it floats but in the brain, and comes not near the heart, then, if you expect

Digitized by Google

to be read with approbation, you muſt conform your *manner* to that polite indifference, and eaſy unconcern, with which we ſee every other trial of ſkill plaid before us.

Nor is this the worſt. It has brought in uſe a new kind of political Arithmetic, which proceeds upon very unexpected methods of calculation; where the leſſer ſum of an *unacceptable manner* ſhall do more than ſtrike off the infinitely larger of *important ſervices*; it ſhall turn them to demerit: while a long accumulation of well ranged *inoffenſive cyphers* may be made to riſe to millions.

Indeed (ſays this Public) *it*, [your manner] *has furniſhed your enemies with a handle to do you infinite miſchief. Your* COLD *friends lament and make the worſt ſort of excuſe, by imputing it to a temper contracted from the long habit of drawing blood in controverſy;*

Digitized by Google

troverſy; Your WARM *friends are out of countenance, and forced to be ſilent, or turn the diſcourſe.*

Would not any one by this imagine, that the Author of the *View*, after much pretended oppoſition to Infidelity, was at laſt detected of being in combination with it, and all along artfully advancing its intereſts; that the maſk had unwarily dropt off, and that he ſtood confeſſed what Lord Bolingbroke has been pleaſed to call him, *an Advocate for civil and eccleſiaſtical Tyranny.* At leaſt, no one would imagine, that this *handle afforded to his enemies of doing him infinite miſchief*, was no other than the treating the Author of the moſt impious and inſulting book that ever affronted public juſtice, as a bad reaſoner and a worſe Philoſopher, whoſe VANITY led him to abuſe every *Name* of Learning, and his FEAR to diſcredit every *mode* of Religion.

 Theſe

These *cold Friends* however acted their parts as usual; the great secret of which is, the well poisoning an apology, or, as the anonymous writer better expresses it, *making the very worst excuse they can find.* But here, tho' they aimed well, they over-shot themselves. This compliment *of drawing blood in controversy*, the Author of the *View* takes to himself with great complacency. For his *Controversy* having always lain in a quarter very remote from political altercation, either for or against Ministers or Factions; and on no less a question than the truth and honour of Religion, with Infidels and Bigots; the *drawing blood* shews him to have been *in earnest*, which is no vulgar praise. It would be but poor commendation, I ween, of a brave English Veteran who had seen many a well-fought field for Liberty and his Country, to say, he never *drew*

Digitized by Google

blood; tho' ſuch a compliment might recommend the humanity of a Champion at Hockley hole. When the ſituation of the times have engaged two learned Men, at the head of oppoſite parties, to engage in a mock fight, and play a prize of diſputation, with the reward placed, and often divided, between them, it is no wonder if there ſhould be much ceremony, and little *blood ſhed*. But the Author of the *View* writes for no Party, or party-opinions; he writes for what he thinks the TRUTH; and, in the point in queſtion, for the CLERGY, its Miniſters; both of which, (by good fortune, being yet of public Authority) he thinks himſelf at liberty to ſupport, tho' it be by *drawing blood* from premeditated impiety, from low envy, or malicious bigotry; which, he apprehends, are not to be ſubdued by management or a feigned attack. Yet

as

Digitized by Google

as much *in earneſt* as he is, he ſhould be aſhamed to turn the ſame arms againſt ſimple error, againſt a naked adverſary, or againſt the man who had thrown away his weapons; or, indeed, againſt any but him who ſtands up boldly to defy Religion; or, what is almoſt as bad, to diſcredit it, by falſe and hypocritic zeal for the corruptions which have crept into it. In a word, had I written with any oblique views, and not from a ſenſe of duty, I ſhould have ſuited the entertainment to the taſte of my ſuperiors. For a man muſt be of a ſtrange complexion indeed, who when he has *conformed to Religion* for his convenience, will ſcruple to go on and reap the benefit of his compliance, by *conforming to the Faſhion.*

So far as to the Author's *cold Friends.* With reſpect to his *warm* ones, They have not plaid their parts ſo well; they ſeem to have given up

Digitized by Google

up their Cauſe too ſoon. They might have ſaid with truth, and a full knowledge of the caſe, "That no man was readier than the Author of the *View*, to comply with the temper of the times; and eſpecially with the inclinations of his friends, to whoſe *ſatisfaction* he has been ever ready to ſacrifice his own inclinations; but, to their *ſervices*, every thing, except his duty and his honour; was he capable of doing that, he would not deſerve a virtuous Friend: That probably, he conſidered the matter in queſtion as one of thoſe excepted caſes, where he could hearken to nothing but the dictates of honour, and the duties of his ſtation: that he ſaw *Religion* inſulted, a *moral Governor* defied; *Naturaliſm*, a ſpecies of *Atheiſm*, openly, and with all the arts of ſophiſtry and declamation, inculcated, and the oppoſing World inſolently branded as a cabal

of

of fools, knaves, and madmen!" They might have ſaid, "That where errors of ſmall conſequence are in queſtion, or even great ones, when delivered with modeſty and candour, ſuitable meaſures are to be obſerved. But here the impiety and the inſult were equally in the extreme:" To which, in the laſt place, they might have added moſt of thoſe other conſiderations which have been urged in the courſe of this Apology. And had they been ſo pleaſed, the defence had not only been better made, but with much more dignity and advantage.

However the Author of the *View* has yet the vanity, amidſt all this mortification, to reflect, that there is a very wide difference between *diſpleaſing*, and *the being diſapproved*: and that *this very Public*, who complain by the pen of my anonymous Friend, feel that difference.

The

Digitized by Google

The decencies of Acquaintance, habitual impreſſions, and even the moſt innocent partialities, might make them uneaſy to ſee Lord BOLINGBROKE expoſed to contempt; but their love of the Public, their reverence both for its Civil and Religious intereſts, will make them pleaſed to ſee his PRINCIPLES confuted and expoſed. When a noble Roman had in public Senate accuſed one of the greateſt Peſts of his age and country, he obſerved, that the vigour with which he purſued this Enemy of the Republic, made many worthy men uneaſy; but he ſatisfied himſelf with this reflexion, *tantum ad fiduciam vel metum differt, nolint homines facias, an non probent.*

In a word, my duty to God, to my Country, to Mankind at large, had, as I fancied, called upon me to do what I did, and in the *manner* I have done it. If I have offended any good

Digitized by Google

good Man, any friend to my perſon, or my Cauſe, it is a ſacrifice to Duty, which yet I muſt never repent of having made, tho' the diſpleaſure of a friend be the ſevereſt trial of it. I know what that man has to expect both from *Infidelity* and *Bigotry*, who engages WITHOUT RESERVE in the ſervice of Religion. *Benefacere et malè audire* has always been the lot of ſuch Adventurers. But I have long ſince taken my party: "Omnia praecepi, atque animo "mecum ante peregi. Nec recuſo, "ſi ita caſus attulerit, luere poenas "ob honeſtiſſima facta, dum FLA-"GITIOSISSIMA ULCISCOR."

Jan. 4, 1755.

Digitized by Google

LETTER III.

DEAR SIR,

LET me first claim your thanks for sparing you so long on the chapter of Lord Bolingbroke; and then ask you, what you now think of this paper Meteor, which so flames and sparkles; and, while it kept at distance, drew after it the admiring croud; like a Comet, crossing the celestial Orbs, and traversing, and domineering over the established System; in the presage of superstitious Divines, denouncing pestilence and ruin to the World beneath; but in the more philosophic opinion of his followers, re-creating and reviving the driness and sterility of exhausted Nature.

Undè hæc MONSTRA tamen; vel quo de fonte, requiris.

Your love of Mankind makes you see this new Phænomenon with horror. And you ask, Is it for this, that such a torrent of abuse has been poured out upon every private Character, upon every public Order, upon every branch of Learning, upon every System

Digitized by Google

of Philoſophy, and upon every Inſtitution of Religion? They were not poured out at hazard, for all theſe things ſtood in his way: they were not poured out in vain, for they are given for *Arguments*; and will, I make no doubt, be ſo received. The wiſe Quintilian, it is true, has obſerved, *Propriam* MODERATIONEM, QUÆDAM CAUSÆ *deſiderant*. And it muſt be confeſſed, that if ever *Moderation*, and temperance of expreſſion, became an author, or was well ſuited to his diſcourſe, it was when the purpoſe of his work, like that of his Lordſhip's, was to overturn all ESTABLISHED RELIGION, founded in the belief of a Sovereign Maſter, ſupremely *juſt* and *good*; and all ESTABLISHED LEARNING, employed for the defence of ſuch Religion: And, on their ruins, to erect NATURALISM, inſtead of real Theiſm, and a FIRST PHILOSOPHY, inſtead of real Science. When, I ſay, a Writer had thought proper to inſult the common ſentiments of Mankind, on points eſteemed ſo eſſential to their well being, common policy, as well as common decency, required, that it ſhould be done by the moſt winning inſinuation and addreſs; and not by calling every man, who would

Digitized by Google

would not take his ſyſtem upon truſt, MADMAN, KNAVE, FOOL, and BLASPHEMER.

But ſuperior Genius's have been always deemed above the reſtraint of rules. *Tully* obſerves, that ARCESILAS, fitted by a turbulence of temper, to confound the peace, and overturn the eſtabliſhed order of things, had done that miſchief in PHILOSOPHY, which TITUS GRACCHUS had projected in the REPUBLIC [1]. But his Lordſhip, prompted by a nobler ambition, would play both parts in their turns, and ſhine an *Arceſilas* and a *Gracchus* too.

His ill ſucceſs in buſineſs (from which, as he tells us himſelf, he never deſiſted, *while he had hopes of doing any good*) forced him to turn his great talents from POLITICS to PHILOSOPHY. But he had not yet mortified that Ambition which was always prompting him to aſpire to the head of things: and he carried with him that ſufficiency, and thoſe reſentments, which had proved ſo ill ſuited to the Cabinets of Princes, into the Cloſet of the Philoſopher.

We may add, that he entered upon *Let-*

[1] Tum exortus eſt, ut in Optima Rep. Ti. Gracchus qui etiam perturbaret, ſic Arceſilas, qui *conſtitutam* Philoſophiam everteret.

Digitized by Google

ters in an advanced age; and this ſtill further viciated his natural temper by an acquired infirmity, to which, as Tully obſerves, ſuch late Adventurers are extremely ſubject. ΟΨΙΜΑΘΕΙΣ *autem homines ſcis* QUAM INSOLENTES *ſint:* "You know, "ſays he, how INSOLENT thoſe men ge-"nerally are, who come late to their book."

But now having given you *my* thoughts of his Lordſhip's *aſſuming* temper, it would be unfair not to give you his own; eſpecially as he has been ſo ingenuous to make no ſecret of it. He had kept, it ſeems, ill company; and his *natural candor and modeſty* had been hurt by it. But let him tell his own ſtory: "I grow VERY APT TO "ASSUME, by converſing ſo much with "ECCLESIASTICAL WRITERS, who aſ-"ſume much oftener than they prove [2]."

But whatever cauſes concurred to form this temper, certain it is, that his *contempt of others* was become ſo habitual to him, that it operates where no reaſonable provocation can be aſſigned. I have ſhewn you, in my firſt Letter, at what a rate, his diſguſt to the *Morals*, and his averſion to the *Sanctions*, of the GOSPEL, diſpoſed him to treat all who had

[2] Vol. iv. p. 504.

contributed

Digitized by Google

contributed to propagate, or to ſupport, *Revelation*. But how the honeſt PAGANS of antiquity had offended, who, many of them, believed no more of a *future ſtate* than himſelf, is a little hard to conceive.

Yet PYTHAGORAS, he tells us, was a turbulent fellow, and a fanatical ſubverter of States.

Nor did PLATO's *delirious brains* [3] ſecure him from becoming, on occaſion, a paultry cheat, and a mercenary flatterer. For almoſt all his *Madmen* are *Knaves* into the bargain. But Plato had made himſelf notorious, by the *blaſphemous* title he had given to the *firſt Cauſe*, of the FIRST GOOD. So that his Lordſhip regarded him as at the head of that wicked Sect, who aſcribe *moral attributes* to the Deity.

Even SOCRATES, whoſe glory it was, as Tully aſſures us, to take PHILOSOPHY out of the clouds, and bring it to dwell amongſt cities and men, *ſubſtituted* (in his Lordſhip's opinion) *fantaſtic*, *for real knowledge* [4]—*and entertained and propagated* THEOLOGICAL *and* METAPHYSICAL *notions, which are not, moſt certainly, parts of* NATURAL THEOLOGY [5]. We under-

[3] Vol. iv. p. 88. [4] Vol. iv. p. 112. [5] Vol. iv. p. 122.

Digitized by Google

ſtand his Lordſhip very well. He means a *particular* Providence and a *future* ſtate; the *moral* attributes of the Deity, and the *ſubſtantiality* of the Soul. This apparently was *the fantaſtic knowledge which makes no part of natural theology.*

When theſe pagan Heroes fare no better, who would be concerned for Church-men? or much diſturbed to hear CYPRIAN called a *Liar and a Madman* [6]; JEROM, a *furly, foul-mouthed Bully*; and EPIPHANIUS, *an Idiot?*

But now comes on a difficulty indeed.—PAUL and PLATO bear their crimes in their countenance. The *Goſpel of Peace*, he tells us, produced nothing but *Murders*; and the idea of a *firſt Good* was the occaſion of all *evil.* But what had SCIPIO and REGULUS done, to be caſhiered of their Dignities? They were neither *artificial Theologers*, nor yet *mad Metaphyſicians*; but plain, ſober Stateſmen. His Lordſhip's quarrel, we know, is with DIVINITY in all its forms; but he profeſſes to admire the *moral Virtues.* And if there are any of higher eclat than the reſt, and in which his Lordſhip would be more particularly ambitious to ſhine, they muſt needs be CHASTITY and GOOD FAITH,

[6] Vol. iv. p. 407.

Cui

Digitized by Google

CUI, *Pudor*, et Juſtitiæ ſoror
Incorrupta Fides, &c. &c.

Yet he wreſts all his reading to deprive thoſe two brave Romans of their high reputation, when they had ſo fairly earned it by the ſevereſt trials. I am not ignorant of that childiſh infirmity of our nature, a fondneſs for ingroſſing to ourſelves thoſe ſhining qualities with which we may happen to be dazzled; but I can hardly ſuſpect his Lordſhip of ſo ſelfiſh and infantine a project; much leſs would I ſuppoſe him capable of thinking, that SCIPIO and REGULUS may be ſtill thoſe very great men, they have been taken for, though ſtained quite through with *luſt* and *perfidy*.

It is true, indeed, the new Hiſtorian of Great Britain, another of theſe *firſt philoſophy-men* (for the eſſence of the Sect conſiſting in paradox, it ſhines as well in *Hiſtory* as *Divinity*) he, I ſay, tells us, that it will admit of a reaſonable doubt, whether *ſeverity of manners alone, and abſtinence from pleaſure, can deſerve the name of Virtue* [1].

[1] *The Hiſtory of Great Britain*, Vol. i. p. 200 4to. printed at Edinb. 1754.

Digitized by Google

But then he is as ſingular in his notions of *Religion.* He holds but two ſpecies of it in all nature, *Superſtition* and *Fanaticiſm*; and under one or other of them, he gives you to underſtand [7], the whole of *Chriſtian profeſſion* is, and ever was, included. On the Church *of England*, indeed, he is ſo indulgent, to beſtow *all* Religion has to give. For when he ſets it againſt *Popery* it is *Fanaticiſm:* but as often as it faces about, and is oppoſed to *Puritaniſm*, it then becomes *Superſtition*; and this as conſtantly as the occaſions return.

You will ſay I grow partial to his Lordſhip, in appearing ſo anxious for his reputation, while your two favorite characters expire under his pen.

Never fear it. They have not lived ſo long to die of a fright. When his Lordſhip bluſters we know how to take him down. It is only leading him back to that *Antiquity* he has been abuſing.

Half the work is done to my hands; and I ſhall have only the trouble of tranſcribing the defence of *Scipio* againſt his Lordſhip's ſuſpicions, as I find it in an expoſtulatory letter to him, on his recent treatment of a deceaſed friend.

[7] See his Hiſtory throughout.

Digitized by Google

" *The reputation of the first Scipio* (says " his Lordship) *was not so clear and uncon-* " *troverted in* PRIVATE, *as in public life;* " *nor was he allowed by all to be a man of* " *such severe virtue as he affected, and as* " *that age required. Nævius was thought* " *to mean him, in some verses Gellius has* " *preserved; and* VALERIUS ANTIAS *made* " *no scruple to assert, that far from restoring* " *the fair Spaniard to her family, he debauch-* " *ed and kept her.* P. 204, of the *Idea of a* " *Patriot King.* One would have hoped so " mean a slander might have slept forgot- " ten in the dirty corner of a poor Pe- " dant's [8] common place. And yet we " see it quoted as a fact by an Instructor of " Kings. Who knows but at some happy " time or other, when a writer wants to " prove, that *real friendship* becomes a " great man as little as *real chastity* [9], " this *advertisement* [10] of yours may be " advanced to the same dignity of credit " with the calumny of *Valerius Antias.* If " it should, I would not undertake to dis- " pute the fact on which such an infer- " ence might be made; for, I remember,

[8] A. Gellius. [9] See p. 201, of the *Patriot King.* [10] Advertisement concerning Mr. Pope, prefixed to the *Patriot King.*

" Tully,

Digitized by Google

" Tully, a great Stateſman himſelf, long
" ago obſerved, *Veræ amicitiæ difficilli-*
" *me reperiuntur in iis, qui in republica*
" *verſantur.* — But the words of Nævius
" were theſe,

" *Etiam qui res magnas manu ſæpe geſſit*
" *glorioſe,*
" *Cujus facta viva nunc vigent; qui apud*
" *gentes ſolus*
" *Præſtat: eum ſuus pater cum pallio uno*
" *ab amica abduxit.*

" Theſe obſcure verſes were, in *Gellius's*
" opinion, the ſole foundation of Antias's
" calumny, againſt the univerſal concur-
" rence of Hiſtorians: *His ego verſibus*
" *credo adductum Valerium Antiatem* AD-
" VERSUM CETEROS OMNES *ſcriptores de*
" SCIPIONIS *moribus ſenſiſſe.* L. vi. c. 8.
" And what he thought of this hiſtorian's
" modeſty and truth, we may collect from
" what he ſays of him in another place.
" Where having quoted two tribunitial de-
" crees, which, he tells us, he tranſcribed
" from Records [*ex annalium monumentis*]
" he adds, that *Valerius Antias* made no
" ſcruple to give them the lye in public.
" *Valerius autem Antias, contra hanc decre-*

Digitized by Google

"*torum memoriam contraque auctoritates*
"*veterum annalium—dixit*, &c. L. vii. c.
"19. And Livy, in his xxxvi^th book,
"quoting this *Antias*, for the particulars
"of a victory, subjoins, concerning the num-
"ber slain, *Scriptori parum fidei sit, quia*
"*in augendo non alius intemperantior est.*
"And he who will amplify on one occasion
"will diminish on another; for it is the
"same intemperate passion that carries him
"indifferently to each extreme [1]."

REGULUS's virtue comes next under his Lordship's censure: "I know not (says he)
"whether Balbus would have called in que-
"stion the STORY OF REGULUS. Vid. *Au.*
"*Gellium*. It was probably fabulous, in
"many circumstances at least, and there
"were those amongst the Romans who
"thought it to be so [2]." Would not any one now imagine, by his bringing *Au. Gellius* again upon the stage, that there was another *Valerius Antias* in reserve, to depose against REGULUS likewise? just the contrary. The Grammarian, in the iv^th chapter of his 6th book, confirms the common story, with an addition, by the testimo-

[1] *A Letter to the Editor of the Letters on the Spirit of Patriotism, the idea of a Patriot King, and the state of Parties*, &c. [2] Vol. v. p. 406.

nies

nies of the Hiſtorians *Tubero* and *Tuditanus*. The truth however is, that his Lordſhip had his Voucher, though he be ſo ſhy of producing him. It is the reſpectable Mr. TOLAND; to whom his Lordſhip is much indebted for this, as well as better things. Amongſt the poſthumous tracts of that virtuous writer, there is a *Diſſertation*, intitled, *The fabulous death of Atilius Regulus:* in which, from a fragment of *Diodorus Siculus*, preſerved by *Conſtantinus Porphyrogenitus*, he endeavours to prove, againſt all the Roman writers, with *Cicero* at their head, that *Regulus* did not die in torments, but of mere chagrin. Toland only denied that his virtue was put to ſo ſevere a trial; but this was enough for his Lordſhip, to call in queſtion the whole ſtory; and to add, that *there were thoſe amongſt the* ROMANS *who thought it to be fabulous.* Unluckily, the *Roman* writers are unanimous for the truth of the ſtory. How then ſhall we account for his Lordſhip's aſſertion? Did he take Diodorus Siculus for a Latin writer, becauſe he had not ſeen him in Greek? Or did he underſtand A. Gellius as quoting *Tubero* and *Tuditanus* for doubters of the common ſtory?

His

Digitized by Google

His Lordſhip's ambition was uniform and ſimple: it was only, as we ſaid, TO BE AT THE HEAD OF THINGS. As he comes nearer home, therefore, he is more and more alarmed. He found his place already occupied by certain Counterfeits and Pretenders, who had, ſome how or other, got into the throne of Science, and had actually received homage from the literary world. But he unmaſks and depoſes them with as much eaſe as contempt.

"SELDEN, GROTIUS, PUFFENDORF, and "CUMBERLAND (ſays his Lordſhip) ſeem "to be great writers, by much the ſame "right as he might be called a great "traveller, who ſhould go from London to "Paris by the *Cape of Good Hope* [3]." I can hardly think they took ſo large a compaſs. But let us truſt to the Proverb: They and his Lordſhip, never fear, will prove it between them, *that the fartheſt way about is the neareſt way home.* He ſhews us a ready road indeed, but it leads to *Atheiſm*; whereas, if they take us a little about, they bring us ſafely home to *Religion.*

[3] Vol. v. p. 68.

He

Digitized by Google

He profeſſes "a thorough contempt for "the whole buſineſs of the learned lives of "SCALIGER, BOCHART, PETAVIUS, USH-"ER, and MARSHAM [4]." His contempt is well grounded: for having put himſelf to ſchool to them, and learned nothing, it was natural for him to think, there was nothing to be learnt. One may ſurely be allowed to ſay, *he learnt nothing*, when we find him ignorant even of the firſt elements of the ſcience, the meaning of THE YEAR OF NABONASSAR; which being only an *Æra* to reckon from, he miſtook for a periodical revolution of an *artificial Year* [5].

But what need we more? Thoſe to whom he is moſt indebted; whom he moſt approves, and whom he honours with the title of *Maſter*, all ſhare in one common compliment, of inſufficiency and abſurdity.

MARCILIUS FICINUS, he calls the *beſt Interpreter of Plato*; but, at the ſame time aſſures us, he was *perfectly delirious*. But why, you aſk, is *Ficinus the beſt Interpreter*

[4] Vol. ii. p. 261—2.

[5] ——"Beroſus pretended to give the Hiſtory [of "the Babylonians] of four hundred eighty years:— "and if it was ſo, THESE YEARS WERE PROBABLY "THE YEARS OF NABONASSAR." Vol. ii.

of

Digitized by Google

of Plato, ſince *J. Scaliger*, who knew ſomething of the matter, ſays, that *he ſtript his Maſter of his purple, and put him on his own beggarly rags?* For a good reaſon; *Ficinus* taught his Lordſhip all he knew of Platoniſm. But why is he then *perfectly delirious?* For a better ſtill: he holds opinions which his Lordſhip condemns.

His favorite BARROW, he tells us, "goes "on, a long while, begging the queſtion, "and talking in a theological cant MORE "WORTHY OF PAUL than of a man like "him [6]—flimzy ſtuff, which a man is "obliged to vend, when he puts on a black "gown and band [7]."

LOCKE and NEWTON, he inſinuates, were his Heroes: Nay, ſuch is his condeſcenſion, that he profeſſes himſelf the pupil of the former. Yet this does not ſecure Locke from being mighty liable to a PHILOSOPHICAL DELIRIUM [8]. And as for NEWTON, the APPLICATION *of his Philoſophy is grown, or growing into ſome abuſe* [9]. Would you know how? By affording CLARKE and BAXTER certain principles

[6] Vol. iv. p. 278. [7] Vol. v. p. 361. [8] Vol. iii. p. 442. [9] Vol. iii. p. 374.

whereby

whereby to demonſtrate, *that the Soul is an immaterial ſubſtance.* An *abuſe* indeed!

But BACON and LOCKE, *as much as he admires them, he is not blind* (he ſays) *to their errors; but can, without being dazzled, diſcern* SPOTS IN THESE SUNS.—

Before I go any further, I will lay you a wager I know what thoſe ſpots are. They are, or I am much miſtaken, no other than the ſtains of *Faith* and the impurities of *Revelation.* But let us hear him.—"I can diſ-"cern a tincture, and ſometimes more than "a tincture, in BACON, of thoſe falſe notions, "which we are APT TO IMBIBE as MEN, as "INDIVIDUALS, as MEMBERS OF SOCIETY, "and as SCHOLARS. I can diſcern in LOCKE "ſometimes ill-abſtracted and ill-determin-"ed ideas, from which a wrong application "of words proceeds; and propoſitions to "which I can, by no means, aſſent. I con-"feſs further, that I have been, and ſtill "am at a loſs, to find any appearance of "CONSISTENCY in an author, who pub-"liſhed a COMMENTARY ON THE EPI-"STLES OF ST. PAUL, and a treatiſe on "the REASONABLENESS OF CHRISTIANI-"TY (which he endeavours to prove by "fact and by argument) AFTER having

"ſtated

Digitized by Google

" ſtated clearly as he has done, the con-
" ditions and meaſures of hiſtorical pro-
" bability; AND AFTER having written
" as ſtrongly as he has done againſt the
" abuſe of Words [1]." Did not I tell you ſo!

——" This SUN's ſick too:
" Shortly he'll be an EARTH:

as the Poet has it, in his deſcription of the peſtilence at Thebes; not more fatal to great Cities than this bloated Vapour of a *firſt Philoſophy*, which mimics, and, as he reflects, defiles that SUN of Science, and turns Nature into Prodigy.

Et SOLEM geminum et duplices ſe oſtendere THEBAS, &c.

But his Lordſhip's account of his other *Luminary*, BACON, is ſtill more extraordinary — He *thinks he diſcerns in him a tincture, and more than a tincture of thoſe falſe notions, which we are apt to imbibe as* MEN, *as* INDIVIDUALS, *as* MEMBERS OF SOCIETY, *and as* SCHOLARS. — That is, as *Men*, we are apt to think we have a SOUL;

[1] Vol. iv. p. 166.

Digitized by Google

as *Individuals*, we are in expectation of a FUTURE STATE; as *Members of Society*, we are inclined to reverence the ESTABLISHED RELIGION; and as *Scholars*, we are taught to *reaſon*, and not to HARANGUE. If any of his Lordſhip's Followers can give a better account of this ſtrange paſſage, I am very ready to reſign the office I have here aſſumed, of being for once his Commentator.

In truth, his Lordſhip deals by RELIGION, and it's Advocates, as a certain french Author, I have red, does by ALCHEMY and the hermetic Philoſophers; he brings almoſt every great name into the number; and after having entertained his reader much at their expence, concludes each various eulogy, alike, —— "Now his folly was in hoping to extract "*Gold* from *baſer metals:*" as the folly of all his Lordſhip's *Alchemiſts* is the hope of bettering *human nature* by GRACE.

You now, Sir, underſtand, how well the diſpoſition of his mind and temper was fitted to his Syſtem. They ſeem indeed to be tallies, and act mutually upon one, another,

Digitized by Google

another, as cauſe and effect, in their turns.

It often happens, that men who arraign Religion, have been firſt arraigned by it; and their defiance of *Truth* is only a repriſal upon *Conſcience*. Under theſe circumſtances it is no wonder they ſhould go to work much out of humour; tho 'it be in an affair which requires a perfect calmneſs of mind, and freedom from all perturbation. But his Lordſhip has the miſerable advantage of being the firſt who has written under one intermitting fit of rage and reſentment. In this ſtate, like a man in a fever, whom no poſture can eaſe, whom no ſituation can accommodate, he is angry at PHILOSOPHERS for explaining what they cannot comprehend; he is angry at DIVINES for believing without explaining. Well then, they change hands; the *Philoſopher* believes, and the *Divine* explains. No matter. He is angry ſtill. In this temper then we leave him, and turn to the proper ſubject of my Letter.

You would know, you ſay, with what abilities he ſupports his Syſtem.

Digitized by Google

The attacks upon Religion have always been carried on, like war, by *Stratagem* and *Force*. I ſhall firſt therefore ſpeak of his *Arts*, and then of his *Powers* of controverſy.

It has been obſerved how cloſely, and how humbly, he copies the FREE-THINKERS who went before him; even to the ſtaleſt of their worn-out ſtratagems.

When FREE-THINKING firſt went upon it's miſſion, the PUBLIC were not diſpoſed to underſtand raillery on a ſubject of this importance: ſo that it is poſſible there might be found amongſt the more early of our anti-Apoſtles, a Confeſſor or two to the glorious cauſe of Infidelity. This put their Succeſſors on their guard; or, what was better, gave them a pretence to *affect* it. From henceforth you hardly ſee an Infidel-book which is not introduced with the obligations, the Reader has to theſe ſervants of Truth, for venturing ſo far in his ſervice, while the Secular arm hovers fearfully over them; With the diſadvantages their cauſe muſt lye under, while it can be but half explained and half ſupported; and with the wonders they

Digitized by Google

have in reſerve, which only keep back and wait for a little more *Chriſtian Liberty*.

This miſerable Crambe made ſo conſtant a part of our diet, and had been diſhed up from time to time with ſo little variety, that it grew both offenſive and ridiculous; for what could be more nauſeous than to feign an apprehenſion of the Magiſtrate's reſentment, after they had writ at their eaſe for almoſt a century together, with the moſt uncontrolled and unbridled licence?

In this ſtate of things could you eaſily believe his Lordſhip would pride himſelf in cooking up this cold kitchen-ſtuff, and ſerving it again and again, in the midſt of ſo elegant an entertainment. "GASSENDI "(ſays he) apprehended enemies much "more formidable than mere Philoſo-"phers, becauſe armed with eccleſiaſtical "and civil power. It is this fear which "has hindered thoſe who have combated "ERROR in all ages; and WHO COMBAT "IT STILL, from taking all the ADVAN-"TAGES which a FULL EXPOSITION OF "THE TRUTH would give them. Their "adverſaries triumph as if the goodneſs of "their cauſe had given them the Victory,

Digitized by Google

" when nothing has prevented their EN-
" TIRE DEFEAT, or reduced their con-
" teſt to a drawn battle, except this, that
" they have employed arms of every kind,
" fair and foul, without any reſerve;
" while the others have employed their
" offenſive weapons with MUCH RESERVE;
" and have even BLUNTED THEIR EDGE
" when they uſed them [2]."

" The adverſaries [of Religion] (ſays
" he again) ſeldom ſpeak out, or puſh
" the inſtances and arguments they bring,
" ſo far as THEY MIGHT BE CARRIED. In-
" ſtead of which theſe ORTHODOX BUL-
" LIES affect to triumph over men who
" employ but PART OF THEIR STRENGTH,
" &c. [3]."

And having, after his Maſters, thus *feigned* a fear, he *feigns* all the precaution of doubling and obliquity, which fear produces. He profeſſes to believe the Miſſion of Chriſt, tho' founded on the diſpenſation of Moſes, a diſpenſation he ridicules and execrates: He profeſſes to believe the doctrines of Chriſt, tho' he rejects his gift of life and immortality; He profeſſes to believe him the Saviour of the

[2] Vol. iv. p. 163. [3] Vol. iii. p. 273.

World,

Digitized by Google

World, tho' he laughs at the doctrine of Redemption which conſtitutes the eſſence of that character.

Well fare the New *Hiſtorian of Great Britain*; who having writ without control againſt Miracles, and even the very Being of a God, gratefully acknowledges the bleſſing; and owns that *We now enjoy* TO THE FULL *that liberty of the Preſs which is ſo* NECESSARY *in every monarchy confined by legal limitations* [4]. It is excellently obſerved too, let me tell you, that tho' the *Monarch* ſhould be *confined by legal limitations*, yet the *writer for the Preſs* ſhould not.

It would be endleſs to enter into his Lordſhip's ſmall arts of controverſy; yet it may not be amiſs to touch upon one or two of them; ſuch I mean as are of more general uſe and the readieſt ſervice.

The firſt is, *To honour the name when you have taken away the thing:* As thus, To expreſs the higheſt devotion to *God*, when you have deprived him of his *moral attributes*:—the greateſt zeal for *Religion*, while you are undermining a *future ſtate*;—and the utmoſt reverence for *Revelation*, when you have ſtript it of *miracles and propheſies*.

[4] *The Hiſtory of Great Britain*, Vol. i. p. 213.

Digitized by Google

2. A *ſecond* is, *To diſhonour Perſons and Opinions, the moſt reſpectable, by putting them into ill company, or by joining them with diſcredited follies.* Thus, Divines and Atheiſts; Clarkians and Malebranchians, are well paired, and always ſhewn together: In like manner, The propoſitions, *that the world was made for man,* and *that man was made for happineſs,* are to be boldly repreſented as two inſeparable parts of the ſame ſyſtem. From whence, theſe advantages follow, that if an *Atheiſt* be odious, a *Malebranchian* mad, and the propoſition of the *World's being made for man,* abſurd; the odium, the madneſs, and the abſurdity fall equally on the *Divines,* on Dr. *Clarke,* and on the propoſition, that *man was made for happineſs.*

3. A *third* is, *To bring the abuſe of a thing in diſcredit of the thing itſelf.* Thus the viſions of the *Rabbins* are made to confute JUDAISM; *Popery* and *School-learning,* to decry the *diſcipline and doctrine of* CHRISTIANITY; and the dreams of *Malebranche, Leibnitz,* and *Berkeley,* to confute the waking thoughts of CUDWORRH, CLARKE, WOLLASTON, and BAXTER: For his Lordſhip is juſt ſuch a confuter of *Metapyſics,* as he would

Digitized by Google

would be of *Ethics* or *Chemiſtry*, who ſhould content himſelf with expoſing the abſurdities of the *Stoics*, and the whimſies of the *Alchemiſts*, and yet fraudulently forget that there are ſuch Authors, as CICERO and BOERHAAVE.—To overturn a FUTURE STATE, he employs all the ſuperſtitious fables of the Poets and the People, concerning it: To diſcredit REVELATION, he enumerates all the Impoſtors, and Pretenders to *revelation* in all ages: And to diſhonour DIVINE WORSHIP, he is very particular in deſcribing the rites and ceremonies of the antient Church of Egypt, and the modern Church of Rome. In a word, you are ſure to find, on theſe occaſions, every ſort of topic, but what the ſober and intelligent Reader requires; *Conſiderations drawn from the nature of the thing itſelf.*

You would expect, however, that, when the ABUSES of things have done him ſuch ſervice as to ſtand, where he has placed them, for the *things themſelves*, he would for once, at leaſt, ſpare the AUTHORS of the *abuſe*, if it were only for the ſake of carrying on his fraud. If you expect ſo much, you are miſtaken in his Lordſhip. He can, in the ſame breath, call the

Digitized by Google

the *abuſes* of Revelation and the Goſpel, by the names of *Revelation and the Goſpel*, and rail at the *Clergy* or at the *Divine* who has introduced thoſe abuſes.

4. Another of theſe ſmall arts, (and with this I ſhall conclude my account of them) is *the covering his own ſuperficial knowledge (and oftentimes his theſts) with calling thoſe who pretend to more, vain ſupercilious pedants.* Thus having largely pillaged a modern Writer, in his account of the Pagan MYSTERIES, he ſubjoins, "To attempt a minute and circumſtantial "account of theſe *Myſteries*, and even to "ſeem to give it, would require *much "greater knowledge of Antiquity than I "pretend to have, or would take the trou-"ble of acquiring.* They who attempt it "have been, and always will be, ridicu-"louſly and vainly employed, while they "treat this ſubject as if they had aſſiſted "at the celebration of theſe Myſteries, or "had at leaſt been drivers of the Aſs who "carried the MACHINES and IMPLE-"MENTS that ſerved in the celebration of "them[5]."

It doubtleſs became him well, to talk

[5] Vol. iv. p. 58.

Digitized by Google

magiſterially on a ſubject of which he underſtood nothing but what he learnt from the Author, he abuſes. How-ever, he is nearer the truth than uſual, when he ſays, *that the author* is as *particular, as if he had been at the unloading of the Aſs*, &c. for though he was not at that ceremony, yet he had his accounts from thoſe who were.—But jeſting is dangerous on learned ſubjects, and in a ſecond-hand wit, when he ventures to employ the ideas of Antiquity. He talks of *this Aſs* as carrying the MACHINES and IMPLEMENTS, for the celebration of Myſteries; *machines* which were for the entertainment of fifty or ſixty thouſand people, at a time, in a great variety of repreſentations. The common Latin proverb might have taught him, that what the *Aſs* carried were the Books of the Myſteries; which if only as bulky as thoſe of the *firſt Philoſophy*, were load enough in conſcience for any ſingle *Aſs*.—But I agree with his Lordſhip, it is not eaſy to ſpeak of theſe *Myſteries* without verifying the Proverb [6].

Thus far for a ſpecimen of his Lordſhip's *arts of controverſy*. But as a good

[6] *Aſinus portat myſteria.*

Mimic

Mimic is commonly a bad *Actor*; and a good *Juggler* a bad *Mechanic*, ſo an artful *Caviller* is as generally a very poor *Reaſoner*.

You will not be ſurprized therefore, if, in examining his Lordſhip's *Philoſophic Character*, under the ſeveral heads of his INGENUITY, his TRUTH, his CONSISTENCY, his LEARNING, and his REASONING, we find him not to make ſo good a figure, as in the *profeſſed arts* of Controverſy.

I. Of his INGENUITY, which comes firſt, I ſhall content myſelf with only one or two inſtances; for his *arts of controverſy*, of which you have had a taſte, are a continued example of it.

1. Speaking of the Chriſtians of the Apoſtolic age, he thus repreſents their character and manners. "Notwithſtanding "the ſanctity of their *profeſſion*, the "GREATEST CRIMES, even that of IN-"CEST, were practiſed amongſt them [7]."

Is it poſſible (you aſk) that his Lordſhip ſhould give credit to the exploded calumnies of their Pagan adverſaries? Think better of his ſenſe and candour: he alludes to no ſuch matter. St. PAUL is his Authority; and he quotes chapter

[7] Vol. iv. p. 513.

and

Digitized by Google

and verſe, to ſupport his charge. This but increaſes your ſurprize. It is very likely: for Philoſophers, as well as Poets, of a certain rank, aim at nothing but (as *Bays* expreſſes it) to *elevate and ſurprize*. Who would not conclude, from this repreſentation, that the firſt Chriſtians began their profeſſion in a total corruption of manners; and that, like the Magi of old, it was a law amongſt them to marry their Mothers and Daughters. Whereas the ſimple fact, as St. Paul ſtates it, in his firſt and ſecond Epiſtles to the Corinthians, was this, A certain man had married his Father's wife; (but whether before or after his converſion, the writer ſays not) and on the Apoſtle's reprehenſion, convinced and aſhamed of his folly, he repented, and made ſatisfaction for the ſcandal, he had occaſioned.

2. Again, theſe wonderful ESSAYS tell us, that when JESUS ſpeaks of *legions of Angels*, it is the language of PAGANISM; but when Lord BOLINGBROKE ſpeaks of *numberleſs created intelligencies ſuperior to man*, it is the language of NATURE: for, this, his Lordſhip aſſures us, *is founded on what we know of actual exiſtence. We are led to it*

Digitized by Google

it by plain, direct, unforced ANALOGY. But that of Jeſus *ſtands on no other foundation, philoſophically ſpeaking, than of a* MERE POSSIBLE *exiſtence of ſuch ſpirits, as are admitted for divers* THEOLOGICAL USES. [8] But why theſe different meaſures, the one for himſelf, and the other for his friends, the Divines? His laſt words let us into the ſecret. His philoſophical *intelligencies* are a very harmleſs race; but the Chriſtian *Legions* are much given to *theological* miſchief. *Miniſtring Angels* bring in, what he can by no means reliſh, a particular, and a moral providence. — God's *phyſical* Providence, and the *civil* providence of the Magiſtrate, make the only Government he acknowledges: Now his *Intelligencies*, like Epicurus's Gods, are always at an idle end; but *Angels* are too buſy and meddling, to be truſted, under his Lordſhip's Philoſophic Adminiſtration.

You cannot however but be pleaſed to find, that the method of reaſoning by *Analogy*, which you had cauſe to think his Lordſhip had totally diſcarded, from the hard language he has ſo often beſtowed upon it, is brought again into favour; and now does wonders.

[8] Vol. iv. p. 179.

3. It

Digitized by Google

3. It not only opens the door, as we ſee, to his Lordſhip's *Intelligencies*, by a *plain, direct, and unforced*, application, but it ſhuts it againſt *Jeſus Chriſt's*. "I only intend to "ſhew (ſays he) that ſince men have not "admitted, in favour of Revelation, a "Syſtem of PHYSICS that is inconſiſtent "with philoſophic truth, there is no rea- "ſon for admitting, in favour of the ſame "revelation, a Syſtem of PNEUMATICS "that is ſo, too [9]."

The favourers of Revelation would own the inference, had his Lordſhip, in ſtating the caſe, not begged the queſtion. As it is, they ſay, his reaſoning, when fairly repreſented, ſtands thus—"Divines reject "the Scripture Syſtem of PHYSICS, which "THEY hold to be falſe, therefore, they "ſhould reject the Scripture-Syſtem of "PNEUMATICS," which HIS LORDSHIP holds to be falſe. Indeed, they conceive this no better an argument than if you was to ſay, That becauſe Politicians, in ſpeaking of the firſt ſource of political power, have called it the *primum mobile*, (alluding to the old erroneous Syſtem of Aſtronomy) and becauſe they have talked too of a *ba-*

[9] Vol. iv. p. 181.

lance

Digitized by Google

lance of Power, (alluding to the true principles of Mechanics) therefore, if we reject their Syſtem of *Aſtronomy*, we ſhould reject their Syſtem of *Mechanics*, likewiſe.

II. Give me leave, Sir, to lead you next and bring you to a place where you may have an advantageous view of this noble Philoſopher's TRUTH, the very Soul of Philoſophy.

1. "The Chriſtian Theology (ſays he) "has derived a prophane licence from the "Jewiſh, which Divines have rendered ſo "familiar and ſo habitual, that Men BLAS-"PHEME without knowing they blaſpheme, "and that their very devotion is IMPIOUS. "The licence I mean is that of reaſoning "and of ſpeaking of the divine, as of the "human, nature, operations, and proceed-"ings; ſometimes with, and ſometimes "without the ſalvo of thoſe diſtinguiſhing "epithets and forms of ſpeech, which "can, in very few inſtances, diſtinguiſh e-"nough. The Jewiſh Scriptures aſcribe "to God, not only corporeal appearance, "but corporeal action, and all the inſtru-"ments of it; eyes to ſee, ears to hear, "mouth and tongue to articulate, hands "to handle, and feet to walk. DIVINES

"TELL

Digitized by Google

"TELL US INDEED that we are not to "underſtand all this according to the *lite-* "*ral* ſignification. The meaning is, they "ſay, that God has a power to execute "all thoſe acts, to the effecting of which, "theſe parts, in us, are inſtrumental. The "literal ſignification is, indeed, abomina- "ble, and the FLIMSY ANALOGICAL "VEIL, thrown over it, is ſtolen from "the wardrobe of EPICURUS; for he "taught, that the Gods had not literally "bodies, but ſomething like to bodies, "*quaſi corpus:* not blood, but ſomething "like to blood, *quaſi ſanguinem* [10]."

DIVINES ſay, that *God has no body nor any thing like to body, but is* IMMATERIAL. EPICURUS ſays, that his *God had not a groſs earthly body, but ſomething like to that body, and was* MATERIAL. Yet "their flimſy *analogical* veil is ſtolen from "the wardrobe of *Epicurus.*" Truly a very ſubtle theft, which extracts MATTER from *figurative expreſſion!* and well ſuited to his Lordſhip's leger-de-main, which draws an *analogical veil* out of a *metaphor.* Indeed, to fit it the better to *Epicurus's wardrobe,* he makes it but a *flimſy* one.

[10] Vol. v. p. 519.

Digitized by Google

But, let us now ſee, the various ſhifts he has been reduced to, in order to ſupport his principal calumny, that *Divines ſtole from Epicurus the method of explaining the nature of the Godhead.*

He ſays, when the *Jewiſh Scriptures* had given GOD a *Body*, the *Divines* found out that it was not to be underſtood *literally*. Whereas the truth is, that the Jewiſh Scriptures themſelves declare GOD to be a SPIRIT, or *immaterial*, in contradiſtinction to *body* or MATTER. And the beſt of it is, that in other places, (as we have ſeen juſt before) his Lordſhip quarrels with the Scriptures on this very account, for their Syſtem of PNEUMATICS. Now what did the *Divines* deduce from thence, but This neceſſary truth, that where the *Jewiſh Scriptures* deſcribe God's actions, in accommodation to the groſs conceptions of men, it is to be underſtood as a mere *figure of ſpeech*. But this would not ſerve his Lordſhip's purpoſe; which was, to convict the Divines of nonſenſe and prevarication.

He, therefore, turns, what the Divines called METAPHOR which is a figure of ſpeech, into ANALOGY which is a mode of

Digitized by Google

of reaſoning, *a flimſy analogical veil:* and Epicurus's ANALOGY, that the Gods had not earthly bodies but ſomething like them, that is to ſay, *material*, he turns into a METAPHOR. *Epicurus* (ſays he) *taught that the Gods had not* LITERALLY *bodies.* Epicurus's queſtion was not about literal or figurative expreſſion; but about ſimilar and diſſimilar things.--- But You have enough, You ſay, of this great Reſtorer of TRUTH, and Reformer of REASON. Others may not be ſo eaſily ſatisfied. However I will be as ſhort, on this head, as poſſible.

3. THE JEWS (his Lordſhip tells us) SUPPOSED CRUELTY TO BE ONE OF THE ATTRIBUTES OF THE DEITY [10]. —Theſe very JEWS themſelves ſay, That *the Lord is gracious and full of compaſſion; ſlow to anger and of great mercy:* That *he is good to all; and his tender mercies are over* ALL HIS WORKS [1]: That *his mercy endureth for* EVER [2]: That *the* EARTH *is full of the goodneſs and mercy of the Lord* [3]: That *his mercy is from* EVERLASTING TO EVER-

[10] Vol. v. p. 507. [1] Pſ. cxlv. ver. 8, 9. [2] Chron. Jer. Eſra, Pſalms, &c. [3] Pſ. xxxiii. ver. 5. cxix. ver. 64.

Digitized by Google

LASTING [4]. Now, which of them will You believe?

4. "Superſtition (ſays his Lordſhip) im-
"perſonated *chance* under the name of
"*Fortune:* and this chymerical Divini-
"ty was ſuppoſed to direct arbitrarily
"all the events, whoſe cauſes were
"not apparent, or which exceeded in
"good or ill, the expectations of men.
"The HEATHENS accounted, by it, for
"paſt events; conſulted it about future;
"and referred themſelves to it in doubt-
"ful caſes. It is ſtrange that SUCH SU-
"PERSTITIONS, inſtead of being confined
"to the Heathen world, ſhould have been
"AS PREVALENT amongſt God's choſen
"People, both Jews and Chriſtians; and
"ſhould be ſcarce exploded at this hour.
"It is ſtranger ſtill, that a RECOURSE TO
"THE DECISION OF CHANCE ſhould be
"expreſsly commanded in the *Old Teſta-*
"*ment*, and occaſionally countenanced in
"the *New*, even on ſo important an occa-
"ſion as the election of an Apoſtle in the
"place of Judas Iſcariot [5]."

[4] Pſ. c. ver. 5.—ciii. ver. 17.
[5] Vol. iii. p. 476.

He

Digitized by Google

He aſſerts, we ſee, 1. that the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, as well as the *Heathens*, imperſonated *Chance* under the name of *Fortune*: and 2dly, that their having recourſe to Lots was having recourſe to the deciſion of *Fortune*.

As to the *firſt* aſſertion, it is ſo remote from all truth, that the cuſtom of the Jewiſh People, in referring all events to *God* and to him only and immediately, has given a handle to Spinoza, Toland, and others, to bring in queſtion the very exiſtence of an *extraordinary* diſpenſation.

As to the *ſecond*, we muſt obſerve that LOTS are to be conſidered in three different lights: or, more properly, they are of three diſtinct kinds.

One ſort is a civil balloting, of general uſe in States to prevent intrigues and partialities. SORTEM *poſuiſſent*, ſays Tacitus, *ne ambitioni aut inimicitiis locus foret*.

Another, is a ſuperſtitious appeal to the imaginary Deity, *Chance* or *Fortune*.

And there is yet another, which is a reference of the event to Heaven, by God's own direction and appointment.

Digitized by Google

Of the *ſecond*, and only reprehenſible ſort, Revelation, as we have juſt now ſhewn, is entirely innocent.

Of the firſt, his Lordſhip, as a Politician, will not diſallow the uſe: His quarrel, as a Philoſopher, is with the *third*. And he has no way to ſupport his charge, but by ſophiſtically reducing it into the *ſecond*; that is, repreſenting it as having all the ſuperſtition of the *ſecond*. Now in this he begs the queſtion.——Are the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Revelations true or commentitious? Commentitious, ſays his Lordſhip, for ſeveral reaſons; and, amongſt the reſt, for their authorizing the *Pagan ſuperſtition* of LOTS.—What made the Pagan ſuperſtition of Lots? Their being the inventions of men, while they pretended to be of divine appointment.—Very well: but the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Lots were of divine appointment. *Pretended* to be ſo, if you pleaſe, ſays his Lordſhip, and this puts them into the condition of *Pagan lots*.—Softly, my Lord; Your argument muſt not take that for *granted*, which your argument is employed to *prove*.

But his Lordſhip had his head full of that Maſter Sophiſm of the FIRST PHILOSOPHY

Digitized by Google

SOPHY, which concludes againſt the reaſon or juſtice of a DIVINE COMMISSION, becauſe ſubſequent Impoſtors expoſed it to abuſe by pretending to the like command.

For, according to the Logic and Theology of theſe Gentlemen, GOD muſt not caſt out DEVILS, becauſe it afterwards gave a handle for Popiſh Prieſts to juggle with their *Exorciſms*. He muſt not direct a thing to be decided by LOTS, becauſe a village-conjurer would afterwards employ the *ſieve and ſhears*. He muſt not make uſe of HUMAN INSTRUMENTS in puniſhing a people, abandoned to unnatural crimes, becauſe an *Arabian Impoſtor* would afterwards pretend to the like commiſſion. He muſt not inſtitute a multifarious RITUAL, tho' it was to keep a people ſeparate, and to ſecure them from the contagion of Idolatry, becauſe wicked Prieſts and Politicians would eſtabliſh *ſuperſtitious ceremonies* to keep communities enſlaved to civil and religious Tyrants. Theſe ſcrupulous Gentlemen might as well have told us, GOD ſhould not have given us Riches, Knowledge, and Power, becauſe there have been

Digitized by Google

ſuch men as CHARTRES, SPINOZA, and MULY MOLECH.

But to go on with his Lordſhip's veracity.

5. He aſſerts, that *they* [the Jews] *made beaſts* ACCOUNTABLE LIKE MORAL AGENTS[6]. He is aware that *to mitigate this abſurdity*, as he expreſſes it, both the Jewiſh and Chriſtian commentators ſay, the pain inflicted on beaſts was to ſhew the heinouſneſs of human crimes—to blot out the memory of a great ſcandal—to puniſh the owner for keeping an unruly beaſt, negligently. But he deſpiſes all theſe ſolutions, as ſo many pitiful evaſions. —Would you believe now that in the ſame breath, and merely to ſhew his reading, he ſhould confute his own falſe aſſertion? *I know nothing more abſurd* (ſays he) *than this, except a cuſtom or law at* ATHENS. *The* WEAPONS *by which a murder had been committed were brought into Court, as if they, too, were liable to puniſhment; and the* STATUE *that had killed a man by it's fall, was, by a ſolemn ſentence of that wiſe people, the Thaſii, founded on a Law of* DRACO, *caſt into the ſea.* Now what was his

[6] Vol. v. p. 79.

Lordſhip

Digitized by Google

Lordſhip to prove? That Moſes was ſo ignorant a Lawgiver, and the Jews ſo ſtupid a people, that *they made beaſts accountable like moral agents.* And he illuſtrates it by a law of the moſt celebrated Legiſlator and of the politeſt People, *Draco* and the *Athenians*; who made even *weapons and ſtatues, moral agents.* The *Athenians* and *Draco* perhaps would have ſaid, that they enacted theſe laws to ſhew their *abhorrence of murder*, and to *puniſh the careleſs erecter of a ſtatue.* Mere SHIFTS AND EVASIONS, ſays his Lordſhip.

6. Again, "God (ſays he) was FORCED "to indulge the Jews in ſeveral SUPERSTI-"TIOUS prejudices [7], as learned Di-"vines *ſcruple not* to affirm." Had *learned Divines* no more *ſcruples*, in *affirming*, than his Lordſhip, I ſhould hardly have undertaken their defence.

What they *ſcruple not* to ſay is this—That IDOLATROUS WORSHIP was never ſo entirely corrupt, but that ſome of it's Rites ſtill continued rational, or, at leaſt, remained innocent; and might be uſed in the ſervice of the true God, *without ſuperſtition*:

[7] Vol. iv. p. 30.

That

That the Iſraelites being fond of Egyptian ceremonies, God indulged them in the uſe of ſuch as were harmleſs, and of no other. Nay, his Lordſhip's cenſure, which follows, ſeems to ſhew this was all their crime. He calls theſe Divines *bold Judges of the principles and views of God's proceedings*[8]. For it is more than probable, had they given him the advantage, he ſpeaks of, againſt the *Moſaic Law*, they had never incurred his diſpleaſure. But in what does the temerity of theſe *bold Judges* conſiſt? In this, That God always chuſes to take the *ordinary* means, before the *extraordinary*, when either may be made indifferently to ſerve his purpoſe. And that, therefore, he rather choſe to indulge the Jews in their fondneſs for old habits, and to turn their propenſities for *Egyptian* Rites upon ſuch as were innocent, than to give them new habits, and new propenſities, by a miraculous force impreſſed upon the mind, which ſhould overrule their wills and affections.

7. WE KNOW (ſays his Lordſhip) THAT ALL THEIR [the Jews] SACRED WRITINGS WERE COMPILED AFTER THEIR

[8] P. 32.

CAPTI-

Digitized by Google

CAPTIVITY[9]. Balzac ſpeaks of a certain Critic who uſed to boaſt, that no body, beſides God and himſelf, knew the meaning of this or that verſe in Perſius. His Lordſhip's [WE KNOW] is juſt ſuch another revelation. Only the Critic's *meaning* might be true; but the Philoſopher's *knowledge* is certainly falſe. A falſehood ſo notorious, that I am in ſome doubt whether this ſtricture belong properly to his *dogmatic* or to his *laconic* ſtyle. For *we know*, may ſignify—*We know that the* SPURIOUS ESDRAS *ſays ſo.* And then he gets the two things he moſt wants; a *very uſeful Truth*, and a *very noble Authority*.

8. "The Juſtice, [of the great day] (ſays "his Lordſhip) IF IT MAY BE CALLED "JUSTICE, moſt certainly requires that "rewards and puniſhments ſhould be "meaſured out, in every particular caſe, "in proportion to the merit and demerit "of each individual. But inſtead of this, "it is aſſumed, conformably to the doc-"trine of PLATO, that the righteous are "ſet on the *right hand* of the Judge, and "the wicked, on the *left*; from whence, "they are tranſported into Heaven, or

[9] Vol. iv. p. 339.

"plunged

" plunged into Hell. They are tried *in-*
" *dividually*, they SEEM to be rewarded
" or punished *collectively*, without any
" distinction of the particular cases, which
" have been so solemnly determined, and
" without any proportion observed be-
" tween the various degrees of merit and
" demerit, of innocence and guilt, in the
" application of these rewards and pu-
" nishments [10]."

If it may be called Justice—Marry, well put in. For who knows but, as this is the general day of accounts, and that men see, such a day will be much wanted; who knows, I say, but, rather than be without any, they may be foolish enough to take up with this? They cannot therefore have their prejudices in favour of it, rectified too soon: Let us not cavil with him therefore, for bringing the justice of this court into question, before he has examined the proceedings of it; but rather content ourselves with admiring the wonders of his reasoning. Should I seriously quote the Words of Jesus, — *In my Father's house are many mansions* [1]: And again, *The servant which knew his Lord's will, neither*

[10] Vol. v. p. 495. [1] John xiv. 2.

did

Digitized by Google

did according to his will, ſhall be beaten with many ſtripes. But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of ſtripes, ſhall be beaten with few ſtripes [2]; Should I ſeriouſly, I ſay, quote theſe words, to illuſtrate the truth of this noble writer's obſervation, that men at the great Tribunal *ſeem to be rewarded or puniſhed collectively*, he would, I ſuppoſe, have been amongſt the firſt to laugh at my ſimplicity; at leaſt, the intelligent Reader would not thank me for my diligence.

III. I proceed now to his Lordſhip's CONSISTENCY; the next quality in his philoſophic character. You have ſeen with what bravery he CONTRADICTS *all others*; you ſhall now ſee with what greater bravery he CONTRADICTS *himſelf*.

There are two things which characteriſe the *reaſoning part* of his Lordſhip's writings, (if any part of ſo declamatory a work can be called *reaſoning*) and diſtinguiſh them from all other men's; His INCESSANT REPETITIONS, and his INCESSANT CONTRADICTIONS. Indeed, theſe beauties beget and are begotten of one another. For when a man can furniſh out no better

[2] Luke xii. 47, 48.

enter-

Digitized by Google

entertainment for his Guests than a parcel of groundless flams, he will be much subject to *repetition*; and every repetition as much subject to *variation*; for his tales having neither foundation in Fact, nor measure in Truth, they will be always producing, for admiration; and always new modeling, for convenience, as best suits his present passions and purposes.

His REPETITIONS I leave for the refreshment of those who are disposed to read him through: This short specimen of his CONTRADICTIONS I propose for a more general entertainment.

But as professed *Answerers* never abuse our understandings and our patience more than in this kind of discoveries; it may not be amiss, to say a word or two of a *species of accusation*, which *such* men are always ready to urge on the very slightest occasion, for the convenience which attends it; the convenience of making an Author confute himself when the *Answerer* is unable so to do.

Sometimes the imaginary *inconsistence* arises out of the slow or cloudy apprehension of the *Answerer*, when the *Author* is too brief or too refined: sometimes from the

Digitized by Google

the inaccurate expreſſion of the *Author*, when the *Anſwerer* is too haſty or too captious. It ſometimes ariſes from the Anſwerer's prejudices; and ſometimes again from the Author's prevarication.

Nay (which is ſtranger ſtill) the more exact the diſtinctions are, and the more correct the expreſſion, (and the correcter and exacter they will be in proportion to the Author's knowledge of *words* and *things*) the more ſhall the diſcourſe abound with *theſe inconſiſtencies*. For a heavy or a precipitate *Anſwerer*, will never be able to diſtinguiſh SIMILAR things from IDENTICAL.

Prejudice for a ſet of Opinions may make an *Anſwerer* miſtake ſome things to be in Nature, what they are only in the combinations of the Schools; and finding them conſidered differently (that is, under other aſſociations) by his adverſary who may have no prejudices, or prejudices of another kind, he will be extreme ready to call theſe *differences*, by the more commodious name of *contradictions*.

Laſtly, the *Author*, if he be a FREE-THINKER, has a kind of right, by preſcription, to two or three, or indeed, to

Digitized by Google

two or three dozen of *Characters*, as beſt ſuits his purpoſe, or errand: A practice, which, being begun under a want of Liberty, was continued out of Licentiouſneſs, and is ſtill kept up for the ſake of it's Conveniences. Now if ſuch a one be too lazy to aſſume a *perſonated Character* in form, then, (as Lord Shaftſbury obſerves) *a dull kind of* IRONY *which amuſes all alike*, becomes his favorite figure of ſpeech. But with ſuch a Writer, an inattentive or plain-dealing Anſwerer may give himſelf much trouble, to collect his *contradictions*, and all, to be well laughed at for his pains.

I have fairly marked out theſe various deluſions, that You may have it in your power to detect me, ſhould I be tempted to impoſe upon You, myſelf. Not that I claim much merit from this fair dealing; for his Lordſhip's CONTRADICTIONS are ſo groſs and ſubſtantial, numerous and obvious, that I was under no temptation to make out my ſpecimen by any thing doubtful or equivocal.

1. "I could not (ſays his Lordſhip) "have diſcovered, as NEWTON did, that "*univerſal law* of corporeal Nature, which "he has demonſtrated. But further than

Digitized by Google

"that, he could go no more than I; nor "discover the ACTION OF THE FIRST "CAUSE, BY WHICH THIS LAW WAS IM-"POSED ON ALL BODIES, AND IS MAIN-"TAINED IN THEM [3]." Here, he owns ATTRACTION not to be a REAL or an eſſential PROPERTY OF MATTER, but *the action of the firſt cauſe* upon it. Yet in another place he obſerves, that "ATTRACTION MAY BE, notwithſtanding all the SILLY abſtract reaſoning to "the contrary, A REAL PROPERTY OF "MATTER [4]." The truth is, that, for any thing his Lordſhip knew of this *univerſal Law*, or of the *ſilly abſtract reaſoning* concerning it, ATTRACTION might be Action, Paſſion, Magic, or the Man in the Moon. He only followed his leader, Mr. COLLINS, who diſplayed the ſame Philoſophic ſpirit in ſpeaking of GRAVITY, the *effect* of *Attraction:* And CLARKE's animadverſion on his knowledge will exactly ſuit his Lordſhip's.— "Not content "to have erred ſo very groſsly in the firſt "foundation of all natural Philoſophy; "you could not forbear profeſſing further, "that *you have often admired that* GRA-

[3] Vol. iv. p. 8. [4] Vol. iii. p. 547.

" VITATION *ſhould be eſteemed a matter*
" *of ſuch difficulty amongſt Philoſophers;*
" *and that you think it to be ſo evi-*
" *dent and neceſſary an effect of mat-*
" *ter in conſtant motion perpetually ſtriking*
" *one part againſt another, that you won-*
" *der every body ſhould not ſee it.* I ſup-
" poſe the reſt of the world will no leſs
" *admire* at *you*, for imagining that, by
" ſo ſlight an admiration, you could at
" once ſet aſide all the propoſitions in that
" moſt excellent book [the *Principia* of
" Newton] wherein it is made appear by
" ſtrictly mathematical demonſtrations,
" drawn from the Laws of motion, now
" agreed on by Mathematicians, and
" eſtabliſhed by experiments, and from
" the Phænomena of the heavenly bo-
" dies; that the preſent operations of na-
" ture, depending upon gravitation, can-
" not poſſibly be mechanical effects of
" *matter in conſtant motion perpetually*
" *ſtriking one part againſt another.*—Upon
" the whole, all that you have advanced
" about *gravitation* is ſuch marvellous
" reaſoning, to be made uſe of in the
" preſent age, after ſo many great diſco-
" veries, founded upon experience, and

" even

Digitized by Google

"even mathematical demonſtration; that "tho' I have no cauſe at all to be diſpleaſed with you for arguing in ſuch a manner; yet, I believe, your readers cannot "but think you might very well have forborn going out of your way, to give ſo "very diſadvantageous a repreſentation *of* "*your own* Philoſophy [5]."

2. In one place, his Lordſhip tells us, *that the right of the Iſraelites to the Land of Canaan was founded on the* PROPHECY *of Noah:* in another, that *it was founded on the* PROMISE *to Abraham.* Second thoughts are beſt. He ſeems here to be a little nearer the truth. For tho' a *promiſe* may intitle to a poſſeſſion, I do not ſee how a *propheſy* can do more than foretel one: Unleſs his Lordſhip has ſome ethical engine of a new invention, to extend the grounds of *Obligation,* unknown to GROTIUS, SELDEN, and CUMBERLAND: yet they travelled for it; and, if we may believe his Lordſhip's account of their famous *Journey to Paris,* ſpared for no room in laying foundations. But, in this affair of the PROMISE, his Lordſhip *inſinuates* an

[5] Clarke's third defence of the immateriality and natural immortality of the Soul, againſt Collins.

Digitized by Google

untruth; which is a great deal meaner than *telling* one: For he repreſents it as capricious, arbitrary, and without any reaſon aſſigned.

3. "The Jews (ſays his Lordſhip) as "often as they made God deſcend from "Heaven, and as much as they made "him reſide on earth, were *far from cloath-* "*ing him with corporeity*, and imputing "corporeal vices to him [7]."

Yet two or three pages forward, ſo prevalent is the luſt of abuſe, he expreſsly ſays, *they* DID *cloath him with* CORPOREITY.

Theſe are his words: "The Jewiſh "Scriptures aſcribe to God not only cor- "poreal appearance, but corporeal action, "and all the inſtruments of it; eyes to "ſee, ears to hear, mouth and tongue to "articulate, hands to handle, and feet to "walk [8]." You will ſay, perhaps, that his Lordſhip meant, the Scriptures indeed aſcribed all this to God; but in a *figurative*, not in a literal, ſenſe. I would have ſaid ſo too, but that his Lordſhip goes on rating the Divines for underſtanding the Scripture-repreſentation in a *figurative* ſenſe.

[7] Vol. v. p. 515. [8] P. 519.

Which,

Digitized by Google

Which, too, he ſhews does not mend the matter; this *figurative* ſenſe being ſtolen from Epicurus. Now we know that Epicurus certainly believed the Gods to be CORPOREAL (if he believed any) tho' made of a finer ſtuff than mere mortal bodies. "Divines (ſays his Lordſhip) tell "us indeed, that we are not to underſtand "all this according to the literal ſignifi-"cation, &c. But this *ſlimſy theological* "*veil* thrown over the literal ſignification "is ſtolen from the wardrobe of Epicu-"rus [9]." His Lordſhip's wardrobe ſeems to be as rich as Epicurus's, in VEILS: a little after, we have a very curious one, *a thin and trite* VEIL *of analogy:* and he is ready to lend them to Divines, as Lucullus did his cloaks *to* the Players, by the dozen.

But whenever his Lordſhip ſpeaks of CHRISTIANITY, a kind of fatality attends him; and his contradictions have then neither ſtop nor meaſure.

4. Speaking of the *laſt Supper*, he ſays, "The perſon by whom it was inſtituted "is repreſented ſometimes under images, "that render it impoſſible to frame any,

[9] P. 519.

Digitized by Google

" of the EFFICACY, or even of the INSTI-
" TUTION, of this Sacrament. Chriſt is a
" *vine*, he is a *rock*, nay he is a *coat*,
" according to St. Paul," &c.[10]. And yet no further off than four pages, he ſays, " There is no one [figurative expreſſion]
" perhaps in the whole Goſpel, leſs liable
" to any equivocal ſenſe than that which
" Chriſt employed when he ſaid, *This is*
" *my body*, and *this my blood*, in the very
" act of giving bread and wine to his Diſ-
" ciples, who were at ſupper with him,
" juſt before his death, for a remembrance
" of which, this ceremony of a ſupper was
" then inſtituted by him. The figure
" was eaſy, the application natural, and
" they could not underſtand the expreſſion
" literally [1]."

His Lordſhip, as you may well think, has commonly *different* purpoſes to ſerve by his contradictions. Here it is one and the *ſame*: to diſcredit a Goſpel inſtitution: which is equally done by ſhewing it to be myſterious, obſcure, and incomprehenſible, where it pretends to clearneſs and preciſion; and low, trite, and mean, where it pretends to ſomething auguſt, peculiar,

[10] Vol. iv. p. 592. [1] P. 596.

and

Digitized by Google

and in the higheſt degree efficacious. All the fault in this caſe, except his Lordſhip's moſt profound ignorance of the nature of the Rite [2], is his bringing theſe two curious obſervations ſo near to one another.

5. "Chriſtianity (ſays his Lordſhip) "as the Saviour publiſhed it, was full "and ſufficient to all the purpoſes of it. "Its ſimplicity and plainneſs ſhewed that "it was deſigned to be the religion of man-"kind, and manifeſted likewiſe the divi-"nity of it's original [3]." This is very gracious. Yet the Scene changes with his Lordſhip's humour; and the *ſimplicity* and *plainneſs* become *dark*, *ambiguous*, and *incomprehenſible*. "That there are "many ambiguous expreſſions, many dark "ſayings, in the Goſpel; MANY DOC-"TRINES, which reaſon could never have "taught, nor is able to comprehend, "now they are taught, cannot be deni-"ed [4]."

[2] See what is ſaid of it, in the xth diſcourſe, *on the principles of N. and R. Religion*, preached at Lincoln's Inn.

[3] Vol. iv. p. 450. [4] Vol. iv. p. 318.

Digitized by Google

But let him recover his temper, and Chriſtianity brightens up again, and we ſee it reſtored to his good graces. "The ſyſtem of Religion (ſays he) which Chriſt "publiſhed, and his Evangeliſts recorded, "is a compleat ſyſtem to all the purpoſes of true Religion, natural and revealed. It contains all the duties of the "former, it enforces them by aſſerting "the *divine* Miſſion of the Publiſher, "who proved his aſſertion at the ſame "time by his *miracles* [5]." But it is only reſtored to be as ſuddenly depoſed. It's birth is ſo far from being *divine*, that he inſinuates it to be *ſpurious*, and neither better nor worſe than a kind of *Baſtard Platoniſm*. "It is aſtoniſhing to obſerve "the ſtrange conformity between PLATONISM and GENUINE CHRISTIANITY "itſelf, ſuch as it is taught in the original "Goſpel. We need not ſtand to compare "them here: Particular inſtances of conformity will occur often enough. In "general, the *Platonic* and *Chriſtian* Syſtems have a very near reſemblance, QUALIS DECET ESSE SORORUM [6]." He then goes on to ſhew, that the common

[5] Vol. iv. p. 314. [6] Vol. iv, p. 340.

Parent

Digitized by Google

Parent of both was not REASON but ENTHUSIASM.

Enthuſiaſm, you will ſay, is now fairly brought to bed of twins, *Platoniſm* and *Chriſtianity*. No ſuch matter. *Genuine Chriſtianity was taught of God* [7].—"As "it ſtands in the Goſpel it contains a "compleat ſyſtem of Religion: it is in "truth the ſyſtem of natural Religion [8]." Well then, we ſhall hear no more of this *ſiſterly reſemblance* to *Platoniſm*. Perhaps not. But you ſhall hear, and that ſoon too, of as great changes. This Chriſtianity is at laſt found to be derived from JUDAISM; that very JUDAISM, which, he had told us, was it ſelf raiſed on THEFT and MURDER—"On the Re-"ligion of the Jews, and on the Au-"thority of their Scriptures, Chriſtianity "was founded [9]." Again, They who "prefer the example and doctrine of "CHRIST to thoſe of PAUL, will find "reaſon to think that the Meſſiah in-"tended rather to reform and to graft "upon Judaiſm, than to aboliſh it [10]."

[7] Vol. iv. p. 348—9. [8] Vol. iv. p. 316.
[9] Vol. iv. p. 317. [10] Vol. iv. p. 350.

And

Digitized by Google

And again; He accuſes PAUL for preaching a *new Goſpel*, called by the Apoſtle, *my Goſpel:* And this new, or peculiar Goſpel, his Lordſhip tells us *was the Myſtery of God's purpoſe to* TAKE IN THE GENTILES, *ſo* INCONSISTENT *with the declarations and practice of* JESUS [1]. Yet for all this, had Chriſt's Goſpel "been "propagated with the ſame ſimplicity "with which it was originally taught by "CHRIST, it would (he tells us) have "been to the unſpeakable benefit of MAN-"KIND [2]."

Let us now ſum up his Lordſhip's Doctrine concerning the GOSPEL OF JESUS. "The Goſpel is ſimple, clear, and of *divine original:* But it is, at the ſame time, dark, ambiguous, incomprehenſible; and, like it's *Siſter Platoniſm*, the *Iſſue of Enthuſiaſm.*—As Jeſus publiſhed it, the Goſpel is a *compleat Syſtem of Natural Religion*, and tends to the unſpeakable *benefit of mankind:* But as Jeſus publiſhed it, the Goſpel was only a *reform* of that Impoſture *Judaiſm*, on which it was *founded*, and was intended by Jeſus to be *confined to the Jewiſh People*; it being PAUL, who,

[1] Vol. iv. p. 323. [2] Vol. iv. p. 316.

Digitized by Google

in direct contradiction to the declarations and the practiſes of Jeſus, turned it into a compleat Syſtem of Natural Religion, and made it tend to the *unſpeakable benefit of mankind*, by extending it to the Gentiles." And thus he goes on contradicting his own aſſertions, as faſt as he advances them, from one end of his Eſſays to the other.

The ſame ſelf-contradictions, which confute his own calumnies againſt Chriſtianity ITSELF, ſtill follow him when he comes to ſpeak of the PROPAGATORS of Chriſtianity.

6. "He (ſays this noble Lord) who compares the Epiſtles of JAMES, of PETER, and JOHN, ſuch as we have them, with thoſe of PAUL, and all theſe with the doctrines of the GOSPEL, will be perhaps of my opinion; at leaſt he will have no ground to ſay of the three firſt, that they were authors of NEW GOSPELS, as he will have grounds to ſay of the laſt, and as the laſt does in effect ſay of himſelf [3]." What was this *new Goſpel?* It was, as we have ſeen juſt before, *the Myſtery of God's purpoſe to take in the Gentiles.* JAMES, PETER, and JOHN,

[3] Vol. iv. p. 320.

there-

therefore, according to his Lordſhip, taught not this myſtery; *ſo inconſiſtent*, as he ſays, with the declarations and practice of Jeſus. Yet ſoon after he confeſſes, that JAMES, PETER and JOHN, did not preach CHRIST's *Goſpel*, but were, together with PAUL, *the Authors* of this NEW GOSPEL. For, ſpeaking of the *Council of Jeruſalem*, he ſays, *The* APOSTLES *had given no directions to inſiſt that the* GENTILES *ſhould or ſhould not, ſubmit to circumciſion, and to the yoaks of the Law* [4]. Which neceſſarily implies a confeſſion, that THEY too were Authors of this new Goſpel, the *Myſtery of God's purpoſe to take in the Gentiles*. The *taking in the Gentiles*, he ſuppoſes a thing agreed on by all the Apoſtles: and that what was yet undone was the ſettling the preciſe *terms* of their admiſſion.

Our Unbelievers look ſo monſtrouſly aſquint upon Religion, that the oppoſite rays of their prejudice are always diſturbing and confounding one anothers effects. Yet, in the general, it requires pains to fix the *contradictions* which ſpring out of theſe fugitive croſs-lights. Commend

[4] Vol. iv. p. 324.

Digitized by Google

me therefore to the Man who brings his *contradictions* to a point; and requires nothing of you but eye-ſight to comprehend them in their full luſtre.

His *pro* and *con* are always near neighbours. So that we ſhall not be ſurprized to find them at laſt, in the following inſtances, incorporated, as it were, into one another.

7. "I much doubt (ſays his Lordſhip) "whether the EVANGELISTS would underſtand the Epiſtles of St. PAUL, THO' "ONE OF THEM WAS HIS SCRIBE [5]."—It was ſaid of One, that he *believed againſt hope:* a ſubject of much mirth to our *firſt-Philoſophy-Men.*

But what is that, to his Lordſhip's greater ſtrength of mind, who can *doubt againſt certainty!*—PAUL and LUKE agreed to preach the Goſpel together: and not only ſo, but that *Luke's* pen ſhould be employed to convey their common ſentiments, and adventures, to poſterity. And yet he queſtions whether LUKE underſtood PAUL's EPISTLES.

[5] Vol. iv. p. 202.

Dic

Dic aliquem, ſodes, heic Quintiliane, colorem
Hæremus —

—Some body, I ſuppoſe, might tell him, that one of theſe *Evangeliſts* was Paul's Companion, his Amanuenſis and Hiſtorian. But his obſervation being too good to be thrown away, he added with infinite dexterity and addreſs——*tho' one of them was his Scribe.*

8. Again, Speaking of the MORAL ATTRIBUTES, the noble Lord obſerves, "We "make God ſo much a copy of man, "that we deſign the worſt, as well as "the beſt of our own features, if I may "ſo ſay, in our repreſentations of him: "and, as common as it is, no unprejudiced "thinking man can hear, without aſto-"niſhment, our *perfections* and our *im-*"*perfections* imputed to the divine Being "in the ſame breath, and by the ſame "men; with this difference at moſt, that "the former are imputed directly, and "the latter ſometimes under the THIN "AND TRITE VEIL OF ANALOGY. In a "Being thus conſtituted, they may well "imagine that the moral virtues are the "ſame

Digitized by Google

"ſame as they are in our ideas: and "Theology may eaſily deduce, from his "attributes, the characters Theology has "given them [6]."

We cannot, ſays his Lordſhip, *without aſtoniſhment ſee our perfections and our imperfections imputed to the divine Being.* His aſtoniſhment is all a flam. There is, indeed, no ſuch *imputation*, even in his own reckoning. For tho' he pretends the *imperfections are imputed*, yet, he ſays, it is *under the thin and trite veil of analogy.* That is, not imputed. For when Scripture ſpeaks of *the outſtretched arm of God, and his all-ſeeing eye*, does it impute *arms* and *eyes* to God, in the ſenſe it imputes *juſtice* and *goodneſs* to him? Yes, ſays he—*under the thin* and *trite veil of analogy.* i. e. *Not* in the ſame ſenſe. As if we ſhould ſay, His Lordſhip AFFIRMS under the *thin and trite veil* of a DENIAL.

This, Sir, is a very ſcanty ſpecimen of his Lordſhip's CONTRADICTIONS. Yet no man appears to be more ſenſible of the diſgrace which CONTRADICTIONS bring upon a writer. For, ſpeaking of the

[6] Vol. v. p. 89.

whole

whole COLLEGE OF APOSTLES, he ſays, *Theſe inconſiſtent Writers talk often a different language on the ſame ſubject; and* CONTRADICT *in one place what they have ſaid in another* [5].

IV. His Lordſhip's profound LEARNING comes next to be conſidered.

1. The firſt inſtance I ſhall give, is fetched from the very penetralia of the *firſt Philoſophy*. "Human knowledge is ſo entirely and ſolely derived from actual BEING, that, without actual Being, we ſhould not have EVEN ONE of thoſe ſimple ideas, whereof all the complex and abſtract notions that TURN OUR HEADS are compoſed [6]."

Here, his Lordſhip cried εὕρηκα, and ſhould have ſacrificed a Bull for his diſcovery: which informs us of no leſs a truth than this, that *if we had had no Being we ſhould have had no ſenſation:* in other words, that *qualities* cannot exiſt without a *ſubſtance*. For if, by *actual being* he did not take in the thinker's own, the obſervation is falſe: a rational Being, tho' exiſting ſingly, has yet the idea of his own exiſtence. But the obſervation is every way

[5] Vol. iv. p. 489. [6] Vol. iii. p. 411.

extra-

Digitized by Google

extraordinary. He ſuppoſes our *ſimple* ideas to be real; he ſuppoſes our *complex and abſtract* notions to be compounded of the *ſimple* ideas; and yet he ſuppoſes that the compoſition has TURNED OUR HEADS. Till now, I underſtood it was *fantaſtic*, and not *real* knowledge, which *turned men's heads*. But I forget; His Lordſhip found the *whole World in a frenzy*; and then indeed it is hardly worth while to enquire what ſet them a going.

2. "The PAGANS (ſays his Lordſhip) "do not appear to have interpolated the "antient *Doctors* of Paganiſm; nor is there "any pretence to ſay that THEY have "impoſed any ſpurious books on the "world, under the name of thoſe *Doc-*"*tors* [7]."

ORPHEUS and MERCURIUS TRISMEGISTUS were certainly *Pagan Doctors*, if ever there were any. And did his Lordſhip never hear, that the Books, Hymns, and Poems, come down to us, under their names, were Pagan forgeries? I will not inſiſt upon the SIBYLLINE ORACLES, which CICERO aſſures us had been *interpolated*, (for the Pagans interpolated

[7] Vol. iv. p. 195.

Digitized by Google

their very forgeries) becauſe I do not know to what conditions his Lordſhip confines the *Doctorate* in the Pagan World, or whether he admits the fair ſex to the honour of the Hood.

However, let us not think him ſo unlearned as not to have heard of theſe forgeries. He had both heard of them, and conſidered them well: And as he is always for putting the ſaddle on the right horſe, (as where he aſcribes *atheiſm* to the *Divines*) he charges all theſe iniquities on the CHRISTIANS. "It was (ſays he) to promote the Opinion, that all the Myſteries of their [the Chriſtians'] Religion, had been revealed by the writings of *Pagan Philoſophers* many centuries before Chriſt, that ſo many books were forged under the names of *Mercurius Triſmegiſtus*, of *Hyſtaſpes*, of the SIBYLS, and perhaps of others."

We are got a good way towards Doctorating theſe old Woman: They are become *Philoſophers*, we ſee. — But whether the Chriſtians were the *only* forgers of *Sibylline Oracles* muſt be left to be decided between Tully and his Lordſhip.

The

Digitized by Google

The truth is, and who, that underſtands antiquity, ever doubted of it? That ſome paganized Chriſtians learnt this trade of forging Books, under antient names, from thoſe whoſe ſuperſtition they had left, but not that ſpirit of impoſture which ſupported it.

3. "The [greek] Hiſtorians, ſays his "Lordſhip, obſerving how fond their "countrymen were of thoſe who writ "Fables, turned Hiſtory into Romance; "and ſtudied to make their relations mar-"vellous and agreeable, with little regard "to truth, in which they were encourag-"ed, AFTER ALEXANDER'S EXPEDITION "INTO ASIA, by the difficulty of diſ-"proving any thing they ſaid of coun-"tries ſo remote[8]." A vulgar man, and one of thoſe his Lordſhip calls Pedants, would have ſaid,—BEFORE ALEXANDER'S EXPEDITION: becauſe the *difficulty* in a great meaſure ceaſed AFTER that Conquerer had opened, and his Succeſſors had kept open, a communication with thoſe *remote countries*.

4. He calls Ariſtotle's Logic, "the "rules of a Dialectic that ſeemed to prove,

[8] Vol. iv. p. 137—8.

Digitized by Google

" and DID PROVE indifferently either in " favor of truth or error [9]". Exaggeration is one of his Lordſhip's favorite figures of ſpeech: but here, puſhed a little too far; for, not content with ſaying that Ariſtotle's *rules of ſyllogizing* (for that is what he means by the *rules of a dialectic*) *ſeemed to prove*, he will needs add, *and* DID PROVE. Which ſhews ſuch a knowledge of Syllogiſm, as needed not the following inſtance to ſet it off. " It muſt not " (ſays he) be imagined, that he who " reaſons, or ſeems, rather, to reaſon " cloſely and conſequentially, has there- " fore truth always on his ſide [1]." I deſire to know who ever thought he had, who did not miſtake (as his Lordſhip here ſeems to do) the art of *ranging* arguments, for the Art of *finding* them? " No body " (his *Maſter Locke* would tell him) can " hinder, but that SYLLOGISM, which " was intended for the ſervice of truth, " will ſometimes be made uſe of, againſt " it. But it is NEVERTHELESS ON " TRUTH'S SIDE, AND ALWAYS TURNS " UPON THE ADVERSARIES OF IT [2]."

[9] Vol. iv. p. 158. [1] P. 159.
[2] Second Letter to the Bp. of Worceſter, p. 31—2. 8° Ed. 1697.

6. Speak-

Digitized by Google

6. Speaking of *Angels*, his Lordſhip thinks fit to hazard this Obſervation: "There is another cauſe of this PNEUMATICAL MADNESS, [the belief of ſuch Beings] the fondneſs of making *man* paſs for one of thoſe Beings that participated of the *divine Nature*. This had long poſſeſſed the heathen Theiſts: and IT POSSESSED THE CHRISTIANS WITH MORE ADVANTAGE [3]."

This ſeems demonſtration that his Lordſhip either never read, or at leaſt never underſtood, an antient Apologiſt. The truth is, there was not one extravagance in all Paganiſm, which afforded ſo much advantage to the primitive Chriſtians as this fond opinion of the antient Philoſophers, that the human Soul was *a part or portion of the divine nature*; nor was there any, they were more eager to expoſe: They laboured, indeed, with ſo much warmth, and ſometimes with ſo little diſcretion, that it hath given a handle for ſome learned moderns to pretend that all the antient Fathers believed the *natural mortality of the Soul* [4]. Well, but

[3] Vol. iv. p. 478.
[4] See Dodwell on this Subject.

Digitized by Google

if the Chriſtians were not *poſſeſſed with this fondneſs*, he will ſhew you, at leaſt, they might have been poſſeſſed with it, and *to more advantage* too. But this part of his Lordſhip's philoſophic Character, his *Reaſoning*, I am not yet come to. However, as we are now upon the borders, it may not be amiſs to uſher it in with this curious argument; which undertakes to prove, that the impious notion of the human Soul's *participating of the divine nature*, *poſſeſſed*, or at leaſt *might have poſſeſſed*, the Chriſtians with *more advantage*, than it did the heathen Theiſts. What then, do you think it is? You will hardly gueſs. It is this, *That Chriſtians are wont to* ASSUME *that man is compounded of body and* SOUL [5]. Well, it muſt needs be allowed, that till we *aſſume*, man has a *Soul*, we can never be *poſſeſſed* with an opinion that his Soul participates of the divine Nature. So much then is admitted, that ſince Chriſtians hold, *man is compoſed of ſoul and body*, they may be *poſſeſſed with advantage*. But how it ſhould be with *more advantage*, than the Heathens, I cannot comprehend. Did

[5] Vol. iv. p. 478.

not

not They, as well as the Chriſtians, hold that man was compoſed of ſoul and body? We need not, I think, any other proof than this notion, of *participation* imputed to them. For they could not, ſure, be ſo abſurd to hold that, *nothing might participate of ſomething*. However, of this I will not be over poſitive, ſince his Lordſhip tells us, they all laboured under an incurable PNEUMATICAL MADNESS.

V. Such an eſcape of his Lordſhip's logic, muſt needs awake us to expect great things from this laſt capital accompliſhment of the *Philoſopher*, his ART OF REASONING: to which, we are now arrived.

1. He will prove againſt LOCKE, that *the notion of Spirit involves more difficulty or obſcurity in it than the notion of body*. Nay, he ſays *he will make* LOCKE *prove this againſt himſelf, that we have more and clearer primary ideas belonging to body than we have of thoſe belonging to immaterial Spirit*. And thus he argues, "Primary ideas are the ideas of ſuch qua-"lities as exiſt always in the ſubſtance to

Digitized by Google

" which they belong, whether they are
" perceived or no. They are therefore
" essential to it, and productive, by their
" operations, of those secondary qualities
" which may be said only to exist in our
" perceptions of them. Of the first sort
" are solidity and extension, to mention
" no others, the primary qualities, and, in
" our ideas the essence of Matter, of which
" we can frame no conception exclusively
" of them. These notions I have TA-
" KEN FROM MR. LOCKE, and they lead
" me to ask what the primary ideas are of
" spirit or immaterial substance? The
" Primary idea or the essence of it is
" THOUGHT; as body is the *extended*,
" this is the thinking substance, SAYS
" DES CARTES. THOUGHT then, AC-
" TUAL THOUGHT, is the essence of the
" soul or spirit, and, by consequence, so
" inseparable from it, that we cannot
" conceive the Soul or Spirit to exist
" separately from, or exclusively of,
" thought. " But this I know to be
" untrue: and I may well own, since
" Locke has owned the same, that I
" have *one of those dull Souls that does*

" not

Digitized by Google

" *not perceive itſelf always to contemplate* " *ideas* [6]."

Won't you naturally ſuſpect him of foul play, when you find him employing the language of one Philoſopher, to confute the ſentiment of another? He is arguing againſt LOCKE concerning the equal or ſuperior evidence of the primary qualities of *Body* and *Spirit*, and he takes DESCARTES's definition of the primary qualities of *Spirit*, to make out his point. In plain truth, he puts the change upon us: he uſes *thought*, or *actual thinking*, for the *faculty of thinking*. It is this Laſt which is *eſſential* to the ſoul and inſeparable from it: It is this laſt, which being a *power* is properly predicated of an *Agent*: It is this laſt which Locke underſtood to be the *primary idea of a ſpirit or immaterial ſubſtance*, when he ſaid that *the notion of Spirit involves no more difficulty nor obſcurity in it than that of body*: And it is the laſt, of which it may be truly ſaid, that *we cannot conceive the ſoul or ſpirit to exiſt ſeparately from, or excluſively of it*.

[6] Vol. iii. p. 510—11.

2. His

2. His Lordſhip owns, that *it is above humanity to comprehend that virtue, whatever it be, whereby one Being acts upon another, and becomes a cauſe.* "Whatever knowledge (ſays he) we ac-"quire of *apparent cauſes*, we can acquire "none of *real cauſality*: by which, I "mean, that force, that power, that vir-"tue, whatever it be, by which one Be-"ing ACTS on another, and becomes a "cauſe. We may call this by different "names according to the different effects "of it; but to know it in its firſt princi-"ples, to know the nature of it, would "be *to know as God himſelf knows*, and "therefore this will be always unknown "to us *in cauſes that ſeem to be moſt under "our inſpection*, as well as in thoſe that "are the moſt remote from it [7]."

Would you believe, now, that it was but a little before, in this very *Eſſay*, that for want of this knowledge, (which yet to affect even *in cauſes that ſeem to be moſt under our inſpection*, would be to affect *knowing as God himſelf knows*) he denies the Soul to be a ſubſtance diſtinct from body. "They (ſays he) who hold

[7] Vol. iii. p. 551.

"the

" the hypotheſis of two diſtinct ſub-
" ſtances MUST EXPLAIN in ſome tolera-
" ble manner, *which they have not yet done*,
" the union, and MUTUAL ACTION ON
" ONE ANOTHER, of unextended and ex-
" tended Beings, or elſe deny the abſolute
" exiſtence of any thing extrinſical to the
" mind [8]."

That is, thoſe who hold the hypotheſis of two diſtinct Subſtances muſt either do that which he holds no Being but the omniſcient can do; or they muſt run mad; or (which I think is ſomething worſe) they muſt ſurrender up themſelves to his Lordſhip's guidance.

He employs the ſame arms to combat INSPIRATION; and with the ſame advantage. The Notion of which is idle and viſionary, becauſe " He has *no*
" *more conception of this ſuppoſed* AC-
" TION *of the divine, on the human*
" *mind*, than he has of the inſpiration by
" which the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from
" the Father and Son, according to the de-
" ciſion of the council of Florence."
That is, he rejects *Inſpiration* becauſe he does not comprehend that virtue *by which*

[8] Vol. iii. p. 521, 2.

Digitized by Google

one Being acts upon another and becomes a Cauſe; altho' he owns none but God can comprehend it.

But his argument againſt the *exiſtence* of the SOUL, and the *reality* of INSPIRATION, is doubly faulty. For not only, to reject a *revealed truth*, when the propoſition in which it is contained is unaccompanied with that explanation of the *cauſe* which our faculties are INCAPABLE of comprehending, is folly and extravagance; but, to reject it even then, when the propoſition is unaccompanied with the explanation which our faculties are CAPABLE of comprehending, is unreaſonable.

3. His Lordſhip endeavours to ſhew, that a *future State was not the Sanction of the Law or Religion of Nature*. And how does he go about it? — "Sanctions muſt "be contained in the Law to which they "belong; they muſt be a part of it. In "their promulgation, they muſt precede, "as the Law does, neceſſarily, all acts of "obedience, or diſobedience to it; — they "muſt be as public — Theſe conditions are "eſſential, there can be no ſanction with-"out them. And therefore the rewards

Digitized by Google

" of *a future State*, which have not theſe " conditions, are no ſanctions of the natu- " ral Law. Reaſon and experience, that " taught men this Law, ſhewed them " the ſanctions of it. But neither of them " pointed out *theſe*. Have we any grounds " to believe, that they were known to the " antediluvian World? Do they ſtand at the " head or tail of the SEVEN PRECEPTS " GIVEN TO THE SONS OF NOAH? Were " they ſo much as mentioned by Mo- " SES [9]?"

Can you poſſibly forbear laughing? Had he found a *future ſtate* in the *ſeven precepts* of *Noah*, or in the *books of Moſes*, be aſſured he would have employed this lucky circumſtance to prove, that a *future ſtate* was not the Sanction of the *Law of Nature*, but the ſanction of a *poſitive Law*, or of a *pretended Revelation*. For in the beginning of this very ſection, has he not attempted to prove it was ſo, from its being found in the GOSPEL? " God (ſays he) has " given a Law, the *Law of Nature and* " *Reaſon*, to all his human Creatures: " the *Sanctions* of it are a NATURAL " TENDENCY of virtue to the happi-

[9] Vol. v. p. 512—13.

Digitized by Google

" neſs, and vice to the miſery, of man-
" kind —They are imperfect —To ſupply
" the imperfection [Revelation pretends]
" that there muſt be neceſſarily ſome *fur-*
" *ther ſanctions* of this Law, and theſe are
" the rewards and puniſhments reſerved
" to a FUTURE STATE. Here is ample
" room for *reflexions* [10]." ——In truth there is: and I have juſt given you a very obvious one, for a ſample.

4. He tells us, that *the worſhip of the one true God was not the firſt Religious Worſhip.* The BIBLE ſays it was. No matter for that. The BIBLE is a farrago of inconſiſtencies [1]. " *Methuſalem* (he
" ſays) ſaw both *Adam* and *Noah*, to
" both of whom God revealed himſelf in
" his Unity. *Shem*, the Son of *Noah*,
" lived even to the days of *Abraham*.
" Need I ſtay to ſhew HOW IMPOSSIBLE
" it is for any man IN HIS SENSES to be-
" lieve that a tradition derived from God
" himſelf, through ſo *few generations*, was
" loſt amongſt the greateſt part of man-
" kind; or that Polytheiſm and Idolatry
" were eſtabliſhed on the ruins of it in the
" days of *Serug*, before thoſe of *Abraham*,

[10] Vol. v. p. 511—12. [1] Vol. iv. p. 19.

" and

Digitized by Google

" and ſo ſoon after the Deluge? I ſhould
" think it IMPOSSIBLE even for the Jews
" themſelves to ſwallow ſo many fables
" and ſo many anacroniſms. Since the
" unity of God was not univerſally taught
" in thoſe early days, it was not ſo *reveal-*
" *ed*, nor preſerved in the manner aſ-
" ſumed. [2]."

This account therefore, he tells us, is INCONSISTENT with itſelf [3]. You will wonder perhaps how it comes to paſs, that theſe two propoſitions, *The Unity was revealed by God to Adam—and the knowledge of it was loſt in a very few generations*—ſhould be ſo unable to ſtand together. The beſt anſwer I can give you is, that his Lordſhip was more attentive to his own paſſionate ſpeeches—*no man in his ſenſes can believe*—*It is impoſſible for the Jews themſelves to ſwallow ſuch fables and anacroniſms*—than to the FACTS which occaſioned all this reſentment. The utmoſt that even Prejudice, in its ſenſes, can make of the Scripture account, is an IMPROBABILITY: and this *improbability*, his Lordſhip himſelf, but two pages afterwards, is ſo good to remove for us. He delivers it as

[2] Vol. iv. p. 20. [3] Vol. iv. p. 19.

a general

Digitized by Google

a general Truth, that "the Vulgar EASILY "embrace Polytheiſm and Idolatry, "even AFTER the true doctrine of the di- "vine unity has been taught and received; "as we may learn from the example of "the *Iſraelites:* and ſuperſtitions GROW "APACE, AND SPREAD WIDE, where "*Chriſtianity* has been eſtabliſhed and is "DAILY TAUGHT, as we may learn "from the example of the Roman "Churches [4]."

Now, Sir, I argue thus, If amongſt the *Iſraelites*, Idolatry and Superſtition ſo *eaſily*, ſo frequently, and ſo inſtantaneouſly *ſucceeded*, to the worſhip of the true God, and needed ſuch ſevere puniſhments to bring men back again to reaſon, in a place were many extraordinary means were provided to keep them in their duty; and if, amongſt *Chriſtians*, Idolatry and Superſtition *grow apace and ſpread wide* where the *true doctrine of the unity* is *daily taught*, how can we wonder that in *ſo few generations*, as from *Adam* to *Serug*, Polytheiſm and Idolatry *had eſtabliſhed themſelves on the ruins* of the Unity; and in an Age,

[4] Vol. iv. p. 22.

when

Digitized by Google

when we hear of no other proviſion for the Truth than the *long lives* of the Patriarchs; and becauſe *Methuſalem ſaw both Adam and Noah?*

If You deny this to have been the caſe of *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, his Lordſhip tells you, You are *out of your ſenſes*: if you own this to have been the caſe of the *Antediluvians*, You are *out of your ſenſes* ſtill. What is to be done? There is but one way; which is, ſubſcribing to his Lordſhip's Wiſdom. But I have ſomething more to ſay of this pretended INCONSISTENCY. — "Can any man in his ſenſes "believe that a Tradition, derived "from God himſelf, ſhould be loſt in "ſo FEW generations, and ſo SOON "after the Deluge?" — How *few*, and how *ſoon*, I beſeech your Lordſhip? I am not captious: I have a ſpecial reaſon for aſking. The Chronology, of this period, is not uniform or conſtant; there is a wide difference in the ſeveral bible-accounts: ſo that I ſuſpect foul play as well as inaccuracy, in your thus putting us off with the vague reckoning of, *ſo few*, and, *ſo ſoon*.

Digitized by Google

To be plain, tho' the HEBREW Copy makes it no more than *three hundred* years from the Deluge to Abraham; yet the SAMARITAN-PENTATEUCH, the SEPTUAGINT, and JOSEPHUS, reckon about a *thouſand:* time more than ſufficient to ſink *the greateſt part of Mankind into Idolatry and Polytheiſm, ſo early as the days of Serug.* And here lies the difficulty, the beſt Chronologers agree in preferring the *Samaritan*, the *Septuagint* and *Joſephus*, to the *Hebrew Copy.*—But I forget myſelf: His Lordſhip has "a thorough contempt "for the whole buſineſs of the Learned "lives of SCALIGER, BOCHART, PETA-"VIUS, USHER, and MARSHAM [5]. *To whom* (he ſays) *the whole tribe of ſcholars bow with reverence*, and conſequently he muſt have the ſame contempt for CHRONOLOGY: Which, indeed, he has ſhewn on more occaſions than one; but never to ſo much advantage, as when he ſuppoſed LIVY and TACITUS to have flouriſhed before VIRGIL [6].

[5] Vol. ii. p. 261, 2.

[6] See Dr. NEWTON's learned and judicious *Diſſertations on the Propheſies*, p. 33.

But

Digitized by Google

But this by the way only. My buſineſs with his Lordſhip at preſent lies in another quarter.

For, having thus (in his attempt to ſhew that the worſhip of the one true God was not the firſt religious worſhip) thrown the BIBLE out of the account, he goes on in this manner:

" If the *inconſiſtency* of this account " makes us reject it, we ſhall find leſs " reaſon to believe, on the Authority of " *prophane traditions*, that the UNITY " OF GOD WAS THE PRIMITIVE FAITH " of mankind. Revelations to the Fa- " ther and to the Reſtorer of the whole " human race might have eſtabliſhed this " faith univerſally: but without Revela- " tion it could not be that of any one " people, till obſervation and meditation, " till a full and vigorous exerciſe of Reaſon " made it ſuch [7]."

The reaſoning is truly admirable. The ſuppoſed Fact, as we find it in ANTIQUITY, ſtands thus, According to the BIBLE, the worſhip of the true God was the firſt religious worſhip: GENTILE TRADITION

[7] Vol. iv. p. 20.

Digitized by Google

ſays much the ſame. Between theſe two Teſtimonies there is a natural and ſtrange connexion. The *Tradition* appears to riſe out of the *Written word:* For, as his Lordſhip well obſerves, *nothing but a Revelation could eſtabliſh this Faith univerſally, not even amongſt one people, till obſervation and meditation had made it familiar to them.* Here you have the Fact proved in the ſtrongeſt manner a Fact can be proved; by the concurrence of two Witneſſes, coming from different quarters, and ſtrangers to one another's evidence; which yet not only agree, but mutually ſupport each other. What would you more?—Hold a little, ſays his Lordſhip, This boaſted connection between ſacred and prophane Hiſtory has no foundation: the *ſacred* is not to be believed, becauſe *inconſiſtent:* the *prophane* is not to be believed, becauſe it has no ſupport but what it receives from the *Sacred.* Thus ſtands his Lordſhip's reaſoning, or, at leaſt, thus it would ſtand had he urged it to the beſt advantage. And to this, I have already replied, that his Lordſhip, in calling the Bible account *inconſiſtent*, is guilty of an abuſe of of words: that

Digitized by Google

that all which his own premiſſes infer is only an *improbability*; and this *improbability* likewiſe, he himſelf fairly contradicts and confutes. But I go farther, and in defence of the Bible account obſerve, that if what he ſays be true, That *obſervation and meditation and a full and vigorous exerciſe of reaſon*, are neceſſary to gain the knowledge of the UNITY, in a *natural* way; and that theſe qualities are long a coming; it is then highly probable, that the want of this *obſervation and meditation* when the *unity* was revealed to the *firſt Man*, might be the occaſion of the ſpeedy loſs of it. He expreſsly tells us, that this truth has been ſubject to as ſudden revolutions, when men were in full poſſeſſion of it, with all their *obſervation, meditation, and vigorous exerciſe of reaſon*, at the height; and twenty other peculiar advantages to boot.

But his Lordſhip's *general* management of this queſtion, of the FIRST RELIGIOUS WORSHIP, is too curious to be paſſed over in ſilence; tho' it properly belong to a foregoing Head. He diſcuſſes the point at large, in two ſeparate *Diſſertations*:

Digitized by Google

each of which is ſo well qualified, and ſo fitly accommodated to the other, that the ſecond is a complete confutation of the firſt. How this came about, is not unworthy the Reader's notice. His Lordſhip does things in order. He had firſt of all to diſcredit the Moſaic account of the Creation: And MOSES repreſenting the *worſhip of the true God* as the *original Religion*, he ſat himſelf to prove, that Moſes was both a *fool* and a *liar*. Soon after, he had another Prophet to bring into contempt, the Prophet ISAIAH, who informs us, that the Jews were the only nation under heaven, which had the worſhip of the one God; and this truth EUSEBIUS takes upon his word [8]. His Lordſhip will prove them to be miſtaken. And then he ranſacks all the dark corners, not of antiquity, but of thoſe moderns who have rendered antiquity ſtill darker: in which he ſucceeds ſo well, as to perſuade himſelf that the World, many ages before the foundation of the Jewiſh Republic, had the knowledge of the one God; nay, that there was no time ſo

[8] See *Div. Leg.* Vol. i. Part i. p. 165.

early

Digitized by Google

early in which the one God was unknown. In a word, he overturns, as we ſaid, and very completely too, every thing he had written on the ſame ſubject, in the other Diſſertation, againſt Moſes. But as all this is directly levelled at the Author of the *Divine Legation of Moſes*, I leave that Writer to do his own argument juſtice as he ſhall find himſelf able.

5. I will now, Sir, give you one of his Lordſhip's *palmary* arguments againſt REVELATION.

" Can he be leſs than MAD who boaſts " a REVELATION ſuperadded to REASON, " to ſupply the defects of it, and who " ſuperadds REASON to REVELATION to " ſupply the defects of this too, at the " ſame time? THIS IS MADNESS OR THERE " IS NO SUCH THING INCIDENT TO OUR " NATURE [9]."

Now as every man, who believes REVELATION, was in theſe circumſtances, his Lordſhip (and reaſon good) concluded the MADNESS to be *univerſal*; and none but himſelf in their ſenſes: and ſtanding thus alone he has thought proper to give us frequent notice of this ex-

[9] Vol. iv. p. 172.

Digitized by Google

traordinary caſe [10], *Inſanire me aiunt, ultro cum ipſi inſaniant.* But if he will needs reduce mankind to this ſad alternative, I ſhall make no ſcruple to vindicate our common nature, be it never ſo much at his Lordſhip's expence. For, as to the body of mankind, who "hold that "Revelation was ſuperadded to Reaſon, "to ſupply the defects of Reaſon; and that "Reaſon was at the ſame time ſuperadded "to Revelation to ſupply the defects of Re-"velation," I am ſo far from ſeeing in them any of thoſe unfavourable ſymptoms, his Lordſhip ſpeaks of, that I think, whoever had done otherwiſe had deſerved, (at leaſt, on the principles of his Lordſhip's rigid juſtice) to be ſent to Bedlam. Indeed ſome, for ſo doing, have been actually ſent thither. For what, for the moſt part, are the *religious* inhabitants of that place, but ſuch, who, having ſuperadded Revelation to ſupply the defects of Reaſon, WOULD NOT SUPERADD REASON to ſupply the defects of Revelation; but were for making the *Laws of the Goſpel* the ſole rule of all *civil* as well as of *religious* conduct.

[10] Vol. iv. p. 316—353—377.

Let

Digitized by Google

Let us conſider how the caſe truly ſtands.

The Religioniſt, his Lordſhip ſays, boaſts, that *Revelation* was *ſuperadded to Reaſon*, to *ſupply the defects* of Reaſon. Very well. Reaſon then is the firſt Building; and Revelation, a *ſuperaddition* to it. Revelation meddles not with the work of Reaſon, but ſupplies us with new truths, where Reaſon ſtops ſhort. And why was this done?—For the ſake of an ADEQUATE RULE OF LIFE. Is Reaſon *alone* this rule?—Then the *ſuperaddition* of Revelation was not wanted. Is Revelation alone the rule?—Then Reaſon was mended and improved to no purpoſe. The ADEQUATE RULE therefore is compoſed of BOTH. But if ſo, When Revelation has been added to Reaſon to ſupply the defects of Reaſon, muſt not Reaſon be added to Revelation to ſupply the defects of Revelation? Muſt not two things, thus related, be mutually applied to aid one another's wants? Reaſon is the foundation; Revelation is the ſuperſtructure. It is agreed the ſuperſtructure is neceſſary to *perfect* the foundation. Muſt it not be owned

owned too, that the foundation is as neceſſary to *bear* the ſupeſtructure?

But, what is more, it is the GOSPEL itſelf, and not *artificial Theology*, which preſcribes this conduct to it's Followers. For the *Goſpel* being to ſerve (as is confeſſed) for a ſuperaddition to the firſt building of *Natural Religion*, it delivers no complete ſyſtem of moral Law, (for which it is ſo often reproached by his Lordſhip) becauſe the general parts of that ſyſtem are to be found in *Natural Religion*. For this defect, if it be one, St. Paul has pointed out the remedy, the ſtudy of *natural Religion*, from whence, together with the *Goſpel*, ſuch a complete ſyſtem may be collected. "Finally, "Brethren, whatſoever things are true, "whatſoever things are honeſt, whatſo- "ever things are juſt, whatſoever things "are pure, whatſoever things are lovely, "whatſoever things are of good report; "If there be any virtue, if there be any "praiſe, think on theſe things [1]." What then is the ſcheme of true CHRISTIANITY, but *the ſuperadding Revelation to Reaſon to ſupply the defects of it; and*

[1] Phil. iv. 8.

the

Digitized by Google

the ſuperadding Reaſon to Revelation to ſupply the defects of this too at the ſame time?

Indeed, was REVELATION only a REPUBLICATION OF THE RELIGION OF NATURE, his Lordſhip's charge, tho' extravagantly urged, would appear to have ſome foundation. For then *Revelation* muſt be ſuppoſed to be *Religion of nature*, reſtored and perfected: And then to recur back to *Natural Religion* to rectify *Revelation*, after Revelation had been introduced to rectify Natural Religion, would have, tho' none of the marks of *madneſs*, which conſiſts in arguing conſequentially from *falſe* principles, yet great ſymptoms of *folly*, which conſiſts in arguing like his Lordſhip, from the *true*. But he owns Chriſtianity to be founded on the Principle of REDEMPTION. Indeed he is as variable in this, as in moſt other points, and as often repreſents it to be *a republication of the Religion of Nature*: therefore, as *we* have all along made the beſt of his *Contradictions*, e'en let *him* do the ſame; for it ſeems not fit, he ſhould be debarred any advantages of his own providing.

But

Digitized by Google

But let us ſet his Lordſhip's argument in another light; and turn from his *Philoſophic* to his *Legiſlative* Character; and ſuppoſe him to reaſon thus, (for change but the terms, and the reaſoning will hold juſt as well in *civil* as in *theologic* matters.) "Can he be leſs than mad "who boaſts a *ſyſtem of civil Laws* ſuper-"added to the *natural*, to ſupply the de-"fects of it; and who ſuperadds the *na-"tural* to the *civil*, to ſupply the defects "of this too, at the ſame time?" Now look, what figure the Politician would make, who ſhould thus dictate to his Pupils, even ſuch a one does our noble Theologician make in dictating to all mankind.

Amongſt the numerous abſurdities in this famous argument, I don't know if it be worth while to take notice of one in the expreſſion; for as it ſeems not to be committed with deſign, it hardly deſerves the name of a ſophiſm; and that is, the repetition of the word SUPERADDS: for tho', after the ſuperaddition of Revelation to Reaſon, Reaſon may be ſaid to be *joined* to Revelation; it can never, I think, be ſaid to be *ſuperadded* to it. Becauſe this

Digitized by Google

would be ſetting the two Laws on one another's ſhoulders, and making each become top and bottom in its turn; and this, after he had owned Reaſon to be the *foundation*; and Revelation, the *ſuperſtructure*.

6. Another of his Lordſhip's *general* objections to *Revelation*, is as follows:

" It is not, (he ſays) in any degree, " ſo agreeable to the notions of infinite " wiſdom that God ſhould deal out his " Revelations BY PARCELS, inſtead of " making a ſyſtem of moral Law, when " he created moral agents, that might " anſwer his WHOLE purpoſe, in all cir- " cumſtances of time, place, and perſons; " JUST AS HE MADE a phyſical ſyſtem of " Laws for the other part, the inanimate " part of his Creation [2]."

Now with his Lordſhip's good leave, I am bold to think the contrary to be more probable: and that too on thoſe very principles of analogy, which his Lordſhip employs, to prove it leſs probable. He argues againſt the likelihood of God's giving the *moral Law*, IN PARCELS, becauſe the *Phyſical Law was given* AT ONCE. This plainly proceeds on a ſuppoſition that

[2] Vol. v. p. 544.

the

Digitized by Google

the nature of the two ſyſtems is the ſame; and that there is the like conſtancy and regularity in the *moral* as in the *Phyſical*: For unleſs there be the ſame tendency to order, or to diſorder, in two general Syſtems, the means of governing them can never be the ſame. But obedience to their reſpective Laws, in theſe two ſyſtems, is not the ſame: for *paſſive* MATTER, the ſubject of the *phyſical*, obeys, with ſmall irregularities, the Laws impreſſed upon it by it's Creator; but an *active* MIND, the ſubject of the *moral*, is perpetually deviating from that rule of right which the Governor of the world preſcribed for its obſervance.

The method, therefore, of governing in the two Syſtems muſt needs, according to all our ideas of wiſdom, be very different. And the difference which our ſenſes tell us *has* been obſerved, is that which natural reaſon teaches us to conclude, *ſhould* be obſerved; namely, to a *phyſical* ſyſtem (whoſe ſubject would conſtantly and invariably obey) a Law given AT ONCE: and to a *moral* ſyſtem (whoſe ſubject inclined it to frequent diſorders) a Law given IN PARCELS; which might,

Digitized by Google

from time to time, reform thoſe diſorders as they aroſe.

7. I ſhall conclude my ſpecimen with his Lordſhip's *more particular* objections to his Bible.

Speaking of the civil puniſhment of Idolatry, under the Jewiſh Theocracy, he ſays, "God himſelf was the LEGISLATOR. The Citizens, therefore, of that commonwealth, who apoſtatized, were proceeded againſt as traytors and rebels, guilty of no leſs than high-treaſon. Let it be ſo. *The objections, of injuſtice and cruelty, to thoſe Laws will remain in their full force*, and be of more weight to prove them HUMAN, than all theſe hypotheſes to prove them *divine*. God was KING, and idolatry was no leſs than high treaſon; no objection therefore can lye againſt the Puniſhment of it. None certainly, but every objection to the MANNER and DEGREE in which this puniſhment was to be inflicted, ſtands good [3]."

Here his Lordſhip, to make amends, as it were, for his frequent *denial of the right* without underſtanding the Caſe, has,

[3] Vol. v. p. 193.

for

Digitized by Google

for once, ventured to *agree to it*, upon the ſame terms. It hath been ſaid, " that God " being KING of the Jews, idolatry was " high treaſon." To this, his Lordſhip condeſcends. But to ſhew us how well he underſtood the principle on which it ſtands, he affirms that God's being their LEGISLATOR made Idolatry high treaſon. As if the bare giving Laws to a people conferred the MAGISTRACY on the Giver; or as if there could be *high treaſon* againſt any but the *ſupreme civil Magiſtrate*. But you ſhall ſee more of his talent for PHILOSOPHIC POLITICS, if it fall in my way (as perhaps it will) to ſpeak of his abilities in his own trade. It is his *reaſoning* on the ſubject, not his general *knowledge* of it (things rarely to be found together in his Lordſhip's *Eſſays)* that I now propoſe to examine.

You obſerve then, he owns Idolatry, in Judea, to be high Treaſon; and the Puniſhment of it (which is every where *capital)* to be juſt. But the *manner* and *degree* of that puniſhment he pronounces, both *unjuſt* and *cruel*. Was this like a philoſophic Legiſlator!—When the queſtion is of the

Digitized by Google

the *juſtice* or *injuſtice* of a public Law, every man of common ſenſe, and endowed with the inſtinctive knowledge of *right and wrong*, may paſs a true judgment on it; becauſe it ſtands on the unalterable nature of things: in *human* Laws, on the relation between Magiſtrate and Subject; in *divine* Laws, on the relation between God and man; and in a Syſtem of Laws, like the Moſaic, on one and the other, in conjunction. Now his Lordſhip, in paſſing judgment on the caſe, upon theſe principles, pronounces the Law againſt Idolatry to be right and equitable. What can be more honourable for this part of the Jewiſh Syſtem? It is Lord Bolingbroke who decrees in favour of it; and is aided in his judgment by the plaineſt and cleareſt principles. Hold, ſays his Lordſhip; take this along with you; *Tho' no objection can lie againſt the* PUNISHMENT, *yet every objection lies againſt the* MANNER *and* DEGREE *of it.*

Let us ſee then whether the latter part of this decree ſtands upon the ſame plain and clear principles with the former.

To judge truly of the *manner* and *degree* of a Puniſhment, I apprehend, more is requiſite, than to judge of the Puniſhment itſelf; it requires an intimate acquaintance with the People to whom this Law againſt idolatry was given; their manners, tempers, diſpoſitions, prejudices, and ſituation; In a word, the knowledge of a thouſand circumſtances, which none but the Lawgiver himſelf could perfectly underſtand; certainly, not this Politician of Yeſterday. So that, it appears, the juſtice or injuſtice of the *manner* and *degree* of a puniſhment is not determinable on thoſe ſimple and ſteddy principles, which determine the juſtice or injuſtice of the *puniſhment* itſelf, but on others, which take their different natures of *right and wrong* from many ſhifting circumſtances; from the degree of *temptation* in the object; from the degree of *prejudice* in the affections; of *propenſity* to the Crime; of *malignity* to the Syſtem; and from other various conſiderations, of which only thoſe who are perfect in the knowledge of antient manners in general, and of the Jewiſh People's in particular, can form any tolerable ideas.

This

Digitized by Google

This is enough to shew the folly of cavilling at the *manner* and *degree* of a punishment, after the punishment itself is allowed to be just and right. But this is not all; the very allowance of the *punishment* implies a presumption in favour of the *manner* and *degree*. The *Punishment*, examined, on plain and clear principles, is found to be just: admit now, the *manner* and *degree* of it to be doubtful, for want of knowledge sufficient to shew us the *necessity*, and consequently, the *justice* of them. Is it not fair to infer, that the Lawgiver, who observed the rule of justice in the punishment itself, observed it likewise in the *manner* and *degree* of the punishment?

But his Lordship's cavil at the *degree*, will, perhaps, deserve our more particular notice. *Moses* makes the punishment, capital, but with no unusual circumstances of cruelty attending the kind of death, more than we see inflicted for high treason in all the Countries of Europe at present. The instance of *Naboth* shews it to have been attended with *confiscation*. This circumstance perhaps might have disgusted his Lordship. But in a case, where he was

Digitized by Google

perſonally prejudiced, he ſhould have miſtruſted his own judgment; he ſhould have tried the force of thoſe arguments, by which a great Lawyer had lately evinced, that *forfeitures for high treaſon* is perfectly juſt and equitable.

8. The noble Lord, haranguing on the conditions of *Hiſtorical Authenticity*, delivers this, for one of the chief, "That "the Facts, the principal Facts at leaſt, "be confirmed by COLLATERAL TESTIMONY. By collateral teſtimony (ſays "he) I mean the teſtimony of thoſe who "had no common intereſt of Country, of "Religion, or of Profeſſion, to diſguiſe "or falſify the truth [4]."

This condition of *hiſtorical Authenticity* will be eaſily agreed to; as well as his definition of *collateral teſtimony:* And the quotations of JOSEPHUS and EUSEBIUS, from *Egyptians*, *Phœnicians*, *Chaldeans* and *Greeks*, will, without doubt, be urged by the defenders of Religion, as SUCH *collateral teſtimony*, where the witneſſes *had no common intereſt of Country, of Religion, or of Profeſſion to diſguiſe or falſify the truth.*— Pardon me, ſays his Lordſhip, "JO-

[4] Vol. iii. p. 281.

"SEPHUS

" SEPHUS indeed attempts to ſupport his " hiſtory [the Bible] by *collateral teſti-* " *monies*, thoſe of *Egyptians*, *Phœnicians*, " *Chaldeans*, and even *Greeks*. But theſe " teſtimonies, were they never ſo full to " his purpoſe, would CEASE TO BE COL- " LATERAL teſtimonies, by COMING " THRO' HIM, who had a common inter- " eſt of Country and Religion to diſguiſe " and to falſify the truth [5]."

This ſeems a little hard, that, when our advantages of defence are, in his Lordſhip's opinion, ſo rare, the few we have, ſhould be loſt the very moment they are gained. JOSEPHUS has no ſooner ſeized this important mark of *hiſtorical authenticity*, but it ſlips thro' his fingers as he is urging it: and, what is ſtill more extraordinary, BECAUSE he urges it. The *Book of life* and the *Seat of life*, it ſeems, have this property in common —

" Like following LIFE thro' Creatures you
" diſſect,
" You loſe it in the moment you detect.

For, as Tully well obſerves, all human things are given to change. " Corpora noſtra non

[5] Vol. iii. p. 281.

" novimus. Itaque *Medici* ipſi, quorum " intererat ea noſſe, aparuerunt ut vide- " rentur: nec eo tamen aiunt EMPIRICI " notiora eſſe illa, quia poſſit fieri ut pate- " facta et detecta, MUTENTUR."

But to illuſtrate this wonderful reaſoning, let us make a ſuppoſition, or rather, let us lay down a *fact*, that APION had inſiſted on this very *condition of hiſtorical authenticity*; and that JOSEPHUS, who defended the Bible againſt him, agreed to put the iſſue of the debate upon it: And ſo produced the teſtimony of *Egyptians*, *Phœnicians*, *Chaldeans*, and even *Greeks*, to ſupport the ſacred ſtory. Thus far, his Lordſhip will allow that matters went fairly on, and the argument had its proper efficacy. JOSEPHUS quoted from the Works of *Pagan* writers, tranſmitted to him thro' the hands of *Pagan* readers; and being engaged with a clear-ſighted Adverſary, without doubt, quoted exactly. The *hiſtorical authenticity* of the BIBLE therefore was eſtabliſhed on the terms his Adverſary required.

How then comes it to paſs, that an argument which was once concluſive, has now loſt its force? What was truth in that

Digitized by Google

Age muſt be truth in this; or not only, the *Authenticity*, but the very *being* of Hiſtory will become precarious.

Do theſe pagan teſtimonies, in running thro' the chanel of JOSEPHUS, become *polluted*, as ſoon as the original books ceaſe to exiſt? No, ſays his Lordſhip; but they become *ſuſpected*. Indeed, if he could prove that JOSEPHUS deſtroyed them; or was aiding in their deſtruction; or had a fore-knowledge of their loſs, his Lordſhip might have ſome reaſon to *ſuſpect*. But to talk of ſuſpicion, merely becauſe JOSEPHUS was *intereſted* that the quotations ſhould be to his purpoſe, is ſo vague an objection, as ſhews that ſuch an anſwerer will never be without his cavils. Were the Originals ſtill in being, he would then *ſuſpect* that theſe paſſages had been foiſted in by ſome Jewiſh or Chriſtian Impoſtor; at leaſt, by ſome body or other, who *had a common intereſt of Country, of Religion, or of Profeſſion, to diſguiſe or falſify the truth*. In ſhort, he would *ſuſpect* all the World rather than give up what he had once maintained.

To ſhew you, this is ſaid neither at random nor in malice, conſider his Lordſhip's

Digitized by Google

conduct where this *collateral teſtimony* is circumſtanced as he himſelf requires.

The defenders of Religion ſay, that the PENTATEUCH, which repreſents MOSES as the Leader and Legiſlator of the Iſraelites, is ſupported by that *evidence* which his Lordſhip calls *collateral*. What ſays his good Lordſhip to this? "Be it ſo, that "the Iſraelites had a Leader and Legiſla"tor called Moſes is proved by the con"ſent of *Foreign*, whom I call *collateral* "*Evidences*. But ſurely it will not fol"low, that this man CONVERSED WITH "THE SUPREME BEING FACE TO FACE, "which theſe *collateral* Witneſſes do not "affirm [6]"

Thus you ſee, theſe *collateral evidences* will always be rejected, whether they tell their ſtory *viva voce*, or whether their depoſitions be taken down by ſuch who avail themſelves of their teſtimony.

——But, *they do not ſay that this man converſed with the ſupreme Being face to face*. Would his Lordſhip have believed them, if they did? Why, no, ſays he, I muſt needs reckon ſuch relations amongſt the Miracles of the Greek and Roman

[6] Vol. iii. p. 282.

Hiſtorians,

Digitized by Google

Hiſtorians. Very well, my Lord. And does not this ſhew, that if the *collateral evidence* ſpeak but to Moſes' Legiſlation and civil rule, they ſpeak to every thing they are called for. — It is doubted, for inſtance, whether Livy relates truly the operations of ſuch or ſuch a campaign againſt Hannibal: Polybius, Plutarch, and Appian, are produced as *collateral evidences*, but they ſpeak not a word of thoſe *Prodigies* which the Roman Hiſtorian relates at large.

9. But his hate to Moſes is immortal: Notwithſtanding all his Lordſhip's pretended contempt of him, as a Legiſlator, it looks as if, in his heart, he thought him a formidable Rival. Archbiſhop Tillotſon had attempted to defend the *Authenticity* of his writings, on this footing, *that the unbeliever would only give the ſame credit to them which he gives to every civil Hiſtorian.* His Lordſhip owns the demand to be reaſonable; and is willing to try his Brother Legiſlator, on theſe terms.

In order to this, he obſerves, "That "one condition of the Authenticity of "any human Hiſtory, and ſuch alone "(ſays he) we are to conſider in this "place,

" place, is, that it contains nothing *re-*
" *pugnant to the experience of mankind.*
" Things repugnant to this experience are
" to be found in many that paſs however
" for authentic; in that of LIVY, for in-
" ſtance: but then theſe incredible anec-
" dotes ſtand by themſelves, as it were,
" and the hiſtory may go on without
" them. But this is not the caſe of the
" Pentateuch, *nor of the other Books of the*
" *Old Teſtament.* Incredible anecdotes are
" not mentioned ſeldom and occaſionally
" in them: THE WHOLE HISTORY IS
" FOUNDED ON SUCH, it conſiſts of little
" elſe, and IF IT WERE NOT A HISTORY
" OF THEM, IT WOULD BE A HISTORY
" OF NOTHING [7]."

His Lordſhip's objection to the *Authenticity* of the Bible as a *civil hiſtory*, is, that it is full of *Miracles*: and, ſuppoſing the Defender of Revelation ready to reply, " So likewiſe is the Hiſtory of *Livy*; and " yet that does not deſtroy its credit;" he obviates the reply extremely well. There is an eſſential difference, ſays he, between the Miracles of MOSES and of LIVY. The Roman Hiſtorian's are de-

[7] Vol. iii. p. 279.

tached

tached pieces; they make no part of the ſubject, and are extraneous to it: But the Miracles of the Jewiſh writer are intimately related to all the civil affairs, and make a neceſſary and inſeparable part; *the whole hiſtory is founded on them.* Take away LIVY's miracles, and the train of civil events *goes on* juſt as well *without them*; Take away MOSES's, and his hiſtory becomes a heap of confuſion, or, more properly, *it is a hiſtory of nothing.*

I am proud of any opportunity to acknowledge the obligations which Learning or Religion have to his Lordſhip; I only wiſh the occaſions had been more frequent. As it is, I am unwilling to let the firſt that occurred to me paſs by without my thanks, leſt the occaſion ſhould never return.

In a word, his Lordſhip's obſervation on the *difference* between the MIRACLES in MOSES and in LIVY, is ſolid and maſterly. And *this difference*, let me obſerve, is a certain mark, tho' not of that *civil authenticity* which the good Archbiſhop's argument requires, Yet of that *divine original* which the SCRIPTURES arrogate to themſelves.

It

Digitized by Google

It is the ſpecious, but trite, objection of infidelity againſt the *Miracles* recorded there, that thoſe remote ages were full of prodigies and portents. Why then, ſays the Freethinker, ſhould we believe the *incredible anecdotes* of MOSES, rather than thoſe of LIVY? For a very good reaſon, replies his Lordſhip, we find them in a hiſtory eſſentially different from that of *Livy*. Take away *his* miracles, together with all thoſe of the other pagan Hiſtorians, and the Story ſtands juſt as it did. But take away the BIBLE-MIRACLES, and you reduce the civil part of the relation to a ſtate of inexplicable confuſion.

Again, one of the leaſt hacknied, and indeed leaſt futile, obſervations I have ever heard urged againſt the Bible, (and it has been urged to me) is the WANT OF A NECESSARY CONNEXION between the *civil* and the *miraculous* parts of that Hiſtory. Here again his Lordſhip comes in, in ſupport of Revelation, and ſays, that this *neceſſary connexion* is evident to all, for that nothing can be made of the *civil* part, if you take away the *miraculous*. Which ſure is a *connexion* of ſome ſtrength.

Thus

Thus has his Lordſhip, before he was aware, in attempting to deſtroy the *civil authenticity* of the Bible, ſupported its *divine original*. And this good, tho' undeſigned, ought however to be acknowledged. But you may think, perhaps, that a matter of this importance, is not here ſufficiently developed. Without doubt, it is not. This is a long ſtory; and as I pretend to have ſupplied this DESIDERATUM, *The want of a connexion between the miraculous and civil part of the ſacred Hiſtory*, I ſhall refer you to the proper place, where you may ſee it at large.

In the mean time give me leave to go on with his Lordſhip; And proceed to the propoſition itſelf, That the *Bible Miracles deſtroy its credit as a civil hiſtory*. Now this I apprehend to be a pure piece of chicane. Let us ſee how the matter ſtands between the Archbiſhop and his Lordſhip.

BELIEVERS ſay, the Bible-Hiſtory is the hiſtory of a Diſpenſation really divine: UNBELIEVERS ſay, it is the hiſtory of one only pretended; and endeavour to ſupport their aſſertion, by ſhewing it to have the civil marks

marks of falſehood and impoſture. Here the Archbiſhop ſteps forward and ſays, that he is willing the authenticity of the Bible ſhould be tried on the Standard of a CIVIL Hiſtory. Agreed, replies his Lordſhip; And what ſay you now to MIRACLES? Say? Why, that *miracles* are out of the queſtion; and come not into conſideration till the DIVINE authority be contended for. When we agreed to conſider the Bible as a *civil hiſtory only*, it was not for *truth's*, but for *argument's* ſake. If we held the Writers of it to be mere civil Hiſtorians, the *miracles*, recorded in it, might be fairly urged againſt us; and urged with advantage, if indeed there be that difference between them and *Livy's*, which is pretended. But as we hold the Writers were indeed inſpired, You, my Lord, have ſhewn us, by that difference, to juſtify the *miraculous part*, whenever their inſpiration becomes a queſtion between us. In the mean time, ſtick to your point, and never fancy you can make our Divines the dupes of ſo pitiful a Sophiſm. You have drawn us, while we argue a particular *queſtion* with you, to exclude one of our principles; and then urge againſt *that queſtion*, a FACT, which

Digitized by Google

which ſtands upon the excluded principle, and ſo cannot be defended while the principle remains excluded: Which is juſt, as if, when you had perſuaded us to tye our *hands*, on promiſe that the queſtion ſhould be only about the *uſe of our feet*, You ſhould object to us our inability of laying faſt hold upon you. Your own words, my Lord, where you puſh this imaginary advantage, beſt detect the fraud and impoſture of your proceeding. "The "Old Teſtament (you ſay) is founded in "incredibility. Almoſt every event con- "tained in it, is incredible in its cauſes and "conſequences; and I muſt except or "reject the whole, as I ſaid juſt now. "No one, EXCEPT HERE AND THERE A "DIVINE, will preſume to ſay, that the "hiſtories of the old Teſtament are *con- "formable to the experience of Mankind*, "and the natural courſe of things."

Except here and there a Divine, do you ſay? Nor they neither, I aſſure your Lordſhip. What they ſay is this, That every thing of a mere *civil nature* in the Old Teſtament has all the marks of *civil authenticity*. This is all they ſaid, and

and all they meant to ſay. And, on what good grounds they ſaid it, give me leave to ſhew your Lordſhip a little more at large.

The Bible tells us, the world was created in time; and the time at no immenſe diſtance, as ſeveral fabulous relations of pagan Antiquity had pretended.—And does not the late invention of Arts prove that the Bible ſays nothing but what appears very probable?

It ſays, the Earth was overflowed by a deluge of waters.—And do not the contents of its ſurface demonſtrate that ſuch has been its fate?

The Bible ſays, again, that the *Founders of Cities* were the *inventers of arts*; that the firſt *civil* Governments aroſe from the *Domeſtic*, and compoſed ſmall Monarchies.—And do not experience and the natural courſe of things ſupport this *credible anecdote*?

The Pentateuch informs us, that the Iſraelites, after a long abode in Egypt, went out as a great People, and in an hoſtile manner, to ſeek new habitations.—Of this your Lordſhip may have both external and inter-

Digitized by Google

internal evidence. The *external* are the Egyptian, Phœnician, Chaldee, and Greek Writers, quoted by Joſephus and Euſebius: the *internal* is the whole Jewiſh RITUAL.

Scripture relates the defection of the ten tribes to Idolatry, their tranſportation to a foreign land, and the repeopling that part of Judea with a new Colony of Idolaters.—And of the truth of all this, we ſay, the Samaritan Pentateuch, yet exiſting, is a ſtrong and amazing Witneſs.

Theſe, my Lord, are a very few of the numerous inſtances which might be produced to ſhew the *civil Authenticity* of the Bible. And on theſe and ſuch as theſe, the Clergy's challenge ſtood, when they undertook to prove *that Authenticity*, on the common principles of hiſtoric credit. And further, or other than this, they neither ſaid nor meant to ſay. They underſtood, as well as your Lordſhip, the difference between Moſes's miracles and thoſe of Livy; that the Jewiſh Hiſtory, unlike to all other, is *wholely founded on miracles*. But they diſtinguiſhed better than your Lordſhip, of Moſes' civil Hiſtory: which conſiſts of two parts; the peculiar

Digitized by Google

Diſpenſation to that people, and their tranſactions with their neighbours; and the occaſional ſtory of the reſt of mankind.

It is the firſt only to which his Lordſhip's obſervation can be applied, *viz.* that the *civil* cannot be ſeparated from the *miraculous* part: Nor did the clergy attempt it. It was the other, we muſt needs ſuppoſe, to which the Archbiſhop's challenge referred: And I have ſhewn juſt above, that we are able to make it good.

Thus would I have reaſoned with his Lordſhip; and thus, in fact was he reaſoned with, (as I may have occaſion to tell you in my next *Letter*) but he was deaf to all adviſe, tho' it was given in private, and to ſave his memory from the diſgrace of theſe portentous ESSAYS. What remained was to expoſe them, as they deſerved, to the laughter and contempt of mankind.

And now, Sir, I think I have pretty well diſcharged my general promiſe to You. When one looks back upon this ſtrange collection of poor meagre, disjointed, reaſoning, tied together, in a ſort, by his Syſtem, and ſwelled up, to look like ſubſtance, by the tumor of his Rhetoric, it puts

puts us in mind of the old ſtory of Prometheus; and we ſee his Lordſhip inſulting the ſanctity of the PUBLIC, juſt as that moſt antient of Freethinkers did the ALTAR OF JUPITER; on which, as the Poets tell us, he offered up to the King of Gods and Men, A HEAP OF DRY BONES COVERED WITH FAT.

I am, &c.

ADVERTISEMENT.

In the Preſs,

And ſpeedily will be Publiſhed,

The FOURTH LETTER.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

A

VIEW

OF

LORD BOLINGBROKE'S

PHILOSOPHY;

In Four LETTERS to a FRIEND.

LETTER the FOURTH and LAST.

LONDON,
Printed for JOHN and PAUL KNAPTON,
in *Ludgate-Street*.
MDCCLV.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

LETTER IV.

DEAR SIR,

YOU will wonder to hear again from me on ſo trifling a ſubject as this FIRST PHILOSOPHY. And had not lord BOLINGBROKE brought us to this alternative, either to give up the BIBLE, or his LORDSHIP, to contempt, I ſhould willingly have left him in poſſeſſion of his Admirers.

My laſt Letter examined his Lordſhip's value in every point of *view*, in which a PHILOSOPHER would deſire to ſhine. I ſhall now puſh my inquiry a little further, and venture into his own Province. I ſhall beg leave to try his talents in his POLITICAL capacity, as an Analyſer of States, a Balancer of Power, and a Diſtributer of Civil and Religious Sanctions.

But now I muſt recede a little from the method I have hitherto obſerved, which was to defend, not *this or that body of Divines*, but the *general Principles of natural and revealed Religion*, againſt his Lordſhip's calumnies: Here I ſhall have occaſion to patroniſe a ſingle Clergyman; and not ſuch a one neither as I could have wiſhed; a CUDWORTH, a CLARKE, a CUMBERLAND, or a TILLOTSON; (eſtabliſhed Names, which the Public are ready to make their own quarrel) but a Writer of very ambiguous fame,

Digitized by Google

the Author of the *Divine Legation of Moſes*, and, of *The Alliance between Church and State*: Of whom, I pretend to know little but from the talk of his Adverſaries; his Friends poſſeſſing him, as they do a good Conſcience, in ſilence and complacency; and from his Adverſaries I learn—" But hold, you will ſay, let us drop both his Friends and his Enemies, and hear what the learned abroad ſay of him; for his works have been frequently tranſlated and criticiſed both in Germany and France; We may expect to hear truth from Strangers who are without ſelfiſh partialities and perſonal prejudices."—Indeed, the Author would owe you his thanks for referring him to that deciſion: Foreign Critics of the greateſt name have ſpoken ſo differently of him, from the Scriblers at home, that was I to tell you what they have told the world, you would ſuſpect their encomiums for the civilities of his moſt partial Friends. So to his Adverſaries, I ſay again, I will have recourſe: And from them I learn that he abounds in Parodoxes, that he delights in Refinements, and would fain paſs upon the World a heap of crude index-reading, for well-digeſted learning: that, on his firſt appearance, he was ſhrewdly ſuſpected of infidelity; but that (no body knows how) he has worked men into an opinion, of his being a ſort of friend to Religion; indeed, in his own way: I ſuppoſe

Digitized by Google

ſuppoſe he ſees it for his Intereſt to ſtick to the eſtabliſhed Church; for I know no other reaſon why there ſhould have been different opinions concerning him. In a word, as I judge of him from the repreſentation of his Enemies, I can allow him little other claim to literary merit, than that very doubtful one, *The Dunces, of all denominations, being in Confederacy againſt him.* Indeed, ſince his Lordſhip's diſcovery of a *Confederacy* between *Divines* and *Atheiſts*, the word is likely to become as ridiculous as the word *Ode*, which our Laureate foretells, no body, for the future, will hear without laughing. However, it is ſcarce worth while to retract it; for were there no more in this *confederacy*, than in his Lordſhip's; and that every individual Blockhead only followed the bent of his natural bias, it would but make the wonder the greater.

Such then is the Writer I am forced to take up with: In truth I could not find another, ſo proper for my purpoſe, which was, as I ſaid, to diſplay Lord Bolingbroke's *political* talents. For tho' his Lordſhip be very profuſe in his ill Language to all Men, who have undertaken

Digitized by Google

the defence of *Religion* and *Church Government*; yet the Author of *The Divine Legation of Moſes* is the only one whom he does more than abuſe on this account. For while he keeps at a reſpectful diſtance from the *Arguments* of others, he comes boldly, up to this Writer's, and ſits down before them in form. He Diſputes with him, the Knowledge of the *Unity*—the ſenſe and reaſon of a *ſelect people*—of a *tutelary Deity*—of *compliance with human prejudices*, and, in a word, every leading principle of the Author's Book. This ſeems not greatly for his Lordſhip's honour; after he had defied all the mighty Chieftains of Literature, to decline the combat, and think himſelf quit by accepting the Gauntlet from this puny Writer.

His Lordſhip begins his attack on that capital circumſtance, in the Jewiſh Oeconomy, THE OMISSION OF A FUTURE STATE: He pretends to account for it independently of the EXTRAORDINARY OR EQUAL PROVIDENCE, which Moſes aſſured his people was to be adminiſtred under a *Theocracy*; and which the Author of the *Divine Legation* attempts to prove, from

Digitized by Google

from this very circumſtance of the *Omiſſion*, was actually adminiſtered.

But to make this intelligible to the common Reader, it will be neceſſary to give a ſummary View, of that famous Argument, purſued at large thro' two volumes of the *Divine Legation*; and yet conceived by many of the Learned, to be left imperfect.

RELIGION has been always held neceſſary to the ſupport of CIVIL SOCIETY; and, a FUTURE STATE, (under the common diſpenſation of Providence) as neceſſary to RELIGION; becauſe, nothing but a *future ſtate* can remove the objections to God's moral Government, under ſuch a Providence; whoſe phenomena are apt to diſturb every ſerious Profeſſor of Religion; as it is of the eſſence of religious profeſſion, to believe that *God is a rewarder of thoſe who diligently ſeek him.*

MOSES, who inſtituted a *Religion* and a *Republic*, and incorporated them together, ſtands ſingle amongſt ancient and modern Lawgivers, in teaching a *Religion* WITHOUT the ſanction, or even the mention, of a *Future State of Rewards and Puniſhments.* The ſame MOSES, by uniting

Digitized by Google

the Religion and the Republic of the Jews, into one ſyſtem, made God, by conſequence, their ſupreme civil magiſtrate; whereby the form of Government became truly and properly THEOCRATICAL.

The conſequence of a *Theocratic* adminiſtration muſt be an *extraordinary* or EQUAL PROVIDENCE. And ſo, indeed, the Jewiſh Lawgiver, throughout his whole Inſtitute, has repreſented it to be.

The queſtion between Infidels and Believers has ever been, whether this *extraordinary Providence* was REAL or only PRETENDED?

Here the Author of the *Divine Legation* ſteps in; and undertakes to prove, from the circumſtance of the *omiſſion of a future ſtate*, that it was REAL. His Argument ſtands thus:

If Religion be neceſſary to Civil Government, and if Religion cannot ſubſiſt, under the *common* diſpenſation of Providence, without a *future ſtate* of rewards and puniſhments, ſo conſummate a Lawgiver would never have omitted to inculcate the belief of ſuch a State, unleſs he had been well aſſured that an *extraordinary Providence* was in reality to be adminiſtred

Digitized by Google

miſtred over his People: or were it poſſible he had been ſo infatuated, the miſchief of a Religion wanting a future ſtate, would have been ſoon felt by the People, to the deſtruction of their REPUBLIC; which nevertheleſs continued Sovereign, and in a flouriſhing condition, for many ages.

This is the plain and ſimple ARGUMENT of the *Divine Legation*; which the firſt and the ſecond Volumes of that Work are employed to explain, and illuſtrate. And it muſt be owned, Lord Bolingbroke ſaw it in its force; as appears from his various contrivances to evade it.

This praiſe it would be unjuſt to deny him, when others have underſtood ſo little of the *Argument*, as to imagine that the two firſt Volumes had left it unfiniſhed; and that the *third* was to contain the *concluſion of the Syllogiſm*; tho' the Author had told us, more than once, that the purpoſe of the laſt Volume was only to INFORCE the various parts of the foregoing ARGUMENT, by many new conſiderations; to REMOVE OBJECTIONS to the Character of *Moſes*; and to EXPLAIN THE REASONS of the *omiſſion*.

Digitized by Google

To evade, as we ſay, this Argument, his Lordſhip caſts about for a reaſon, independent of the EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE, to account for Moſes's OMISSION of a *future ſtate*. And his firſt ſolution is this,

"MOSES DID NOT BELIEVE THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, nor the "rewards and puniſhments of another "life, tho' it is poſſible he might have "learnt theſe Doctrines from the Egyptians, WHO TAUGHT THEM VERY EARLY, perhaps as they taught that of the "Unity of God. When I ſay, *that Moſes did not believe the immortality of the ſoul*, nor future rewards and puniſhments, "my reaſon is this, that he taught neither, when *he had to do with a people whom a Theocracy could not reſtrain*; "and on whom, therefore, terrors of Puniſhment, *future* as well as preſent, "*eternal* as well as temporary, could never be too much multiplied, or too ſtrongly inculcated [1]."

This reaſoning can never be too much admired.

[1] Vol. iii. p. 289.

Here

Here we have a *Doctrine*, plauſible in itſelf, and therefore of eaſy admittance; Moſt alluring to human nature, and therefore embraced by all mankind; Of higheſt account among the Egyptians, and therefore ready to be embraced by the Iſraelites, who were fond of Egyptian manners; Of ſtrongeſt efficacy on the minds of an unruly people, and therefore of indiſpenſable uſe; Yet, all this notwithſtanding, *Moſes did not believe it, and, on that account, would not teach it.* What a Politician has his Lordſhip made of this MOSES, a Brother Legiſlator, inſpired only by his natural genius, like himſelf. But now, had MOSES's *integrity* been ſo ſevere, How came he to write a Hiſtory which, my Lord thinks, is, in part at leaſt, a fiction of his own? Did he *believe* that? How came he to leave the Iſraelites, as my Lord affirms he did, in poſſeſſion of many of the ſuperſtitious opinions of Egypt? Did he believe them too? No; but they ſerved his purpoſe, which was, The better governing an unruly People. Well, but his Lordſhip tells us, the doctrine of a *future ſtate*, ſerved this purpoſe beſt of all; for *having to do with a People whom a Theocracy could*

Digitized by Google

not reſtrain, terrors of puniſhment, FUTURE *as well as preſent,* ETERNAL *as well as temporary, could never be too much multiplied, or too ſtrongly inculcated.* No matter for that. MOSES, as other men may, on a ſudden grows ſcrupulous; and ſo, togegether with the principles of common politics, throws aſide the principles of common ſenſe; and when he had employed all the other inventions of fraud, he boggles at this, which beſt ſerved his purpoſe; was moſt innocent in itſelf, and moſt important in its *general,* as well as particular, uſe.

In his Lordſhip's next Volume, this *Omiſſion* comes again upon the ſtage; and there we have *another* reaſon aſſigned for MOSES's conduct in this matter.

" MOSES would not teach the Doctrine " of the immortality of the ſoul, and of a " future ſtate, *on account of the many ſu-* " *perſtitions* which this Doctrine had begot " in Egypt, as we muſt believe, or *be-* " *lieve that he knew nothing of it,* or AS- " SIGN SOME WHIMSICAL REASON FOR HIS " OMISSION [2]."

[4] Vol. iv. p. 470.

We

Digitized by Google

We have ſeen before, that MOSES omitted a *future ſtate*, becauſe he did not believe it. This reaſon is now out of date; and one or other of the three following is to be aſſigned; either, becauſe it *begot ſuperſtitions*; or becauſe *he knew nothing of it*; or becauſe HE COULD DO WITHOUT IT, as the Jews were under an *extraordinary* providence; that being what he means, by the *whimſical reaſon* aſſigned, [by the Author of the *Divine Legation*] *for its omiſſion*.

Let us take him then, at his word, without expecting he will ſtand to it, and having ſhewn, his *two firſt* reaſons not worth a ruſh, leave the *laſt* eſtabliſhed even on his own conceſſions.

1. *Moſes*, ſays he, *omitted a future ſtate on account of the many ſuperſtitions, which this doctrine had begot in Egypt.* But if the *omiſſion* ſtood upon this principle, MOSES muſt have omitted an infinite number of rites and doctrines, which, Lord Bolingbroke ſays, he borrowed from the Egyptians; part of which, in his Lordſhip's opinion, were thoſe very ſuperſtitions, this *Doctrine had begot*; ſuch as the notion of *tutelary deities*; and in part, others

Digitized by Google

others arising out of those; such as the *distinction between things clean and unclean*, an *hereditary Priesthood*, *sacerdotal habits*, and *Rites of sacrifice*.

2. However, he has another reason for the omission: MOSES *might know nothing of it*. To which if I only opposed his Lordship's own words in another place, it might be deemed sufficient; where, giving us the reasons why MOSES did *know something* of a future state, he observes, there are *certain rites, which seem to allude or have a remote relation to this very doctrine* [5]. But I go further, and observe, that, from the very LAWS of MOSES themselves, we have an internal evidence of his knowledge of this doctrine. Amongst the Laws against Gentile Divinations, there is one against that species of them, called by the Greeks NECROMANCY, or *invocation of the dead*; which necessarily implies, in the Lawgiver who forbids it, as well as in the offender who uses it, the *knowledge of a future state*.

3. This being the fate of his Lordship's two reasons, we are now abandoned by him, and left to follow our own in-

[5] Vol. v. p. 239.

ventions,

Digitized by Google

ventions, that is, to take up with SOME WHIMSICAL REASON FOR THE OMISSION: which, however, is ſomething better than the *no reaſons* of his Lordſhip's providing.

But, his Lordſhip diſſatisfied, as well he might, with the ſolutions hitherto offered, returns again to the charge, in the *Corona operis*, his book of FRAGMENTS: And there, he more openly oppoſes the doctrine of the *Divine Legation*; and enlarges and expatiates upon the reaſon, before given, for the *omiſſion*; namely, *the many ſuperſtitions this doctrine had begotten in Egypt.*

"ONE CANNOT SEE WITHOUT SURPRIZE (ſays his Lordſhip) a doctrine ſo "uſeful to ALL Religion, and therefore "incorporated into ALL the Syſtems of "Paganiſm, left wholly out of that of "the JEWS. Many probable reaſons "might be brought to ſhew, that it was "an Egyptian doctrine before the Exode; "and this particularly, that it was propa"gated from Egypt, ſo ſoon, at leaſt, af"terwards, by all thoſe who were in"ſtructed like MOSES, in the wiſdom of "that people. He tranſported much of "his Wiſdom into the ſcheme of Religion

"and

" and Government, which he gave the
" Iſraelites; and, amongſt other things,
" certain Rites, which may ſeem to allude,
" or have a remote relation to, this very
" doctrine. Tho' this doctrine therefore,
" had not been that of ABRAHAM, ISAAC,
" and JACOB, He might have adopted it
" with as little ſcruple, as he did many
" cuſtoms and inſtitutions merely Egyp-
" tian. He had to do with a rebellious,
" but a ſuperſtitious, people. In the firſt
" Character, they made it neceſſary that
" he ſhould neglect nothing which
" might add weight to his ordinances, and
" contribute to keep them in awe. In
" the ſecond, their diſpoſition was ex-
" tremely proper to receive ſuch a doc-
" trine, and to be influenced by it. *Shall*
" *we ſay that an hypotheſis of future rewards*
" *and puniſhments, was uſeleſs amongſt a*
" *People who lived under a Theocracy*, and
" that the future Judge of other People,
" was their immediate Judge and King,
" who reſided in the midſt of them, and
" who dealed out rewards and puniſh-
" ments on every occaſion? Why then
" were ſo many precautions taken? Why
" was a ſolemn covenant made with God,
" as

Digitized by Google

" as with a temporal Prince? Why were
" ſo many promiſes and threatnings of re-
" wards and puniſhments, temporal in-
" deed, but future and contingent, as we
" find in the book of Deuteronomy, moſt
" pathetically held out by MOSES? Would
" there have been any more impropriety in
" holding out thoſe of one kind than thoſe
" of another, becauſe the ſupreme Being,
" who diſpoſed and ordered both, was in
" a particular manner preſent amongſt
" them? Would an addition to the cata-
" logue, of rewards and puniſhments more
" remote, but eternal, and in all reſpects
" far greater, have had no effect? I think
" neither of theſe things can be ſaid.

" What ſhall we ſay then? How came
" it to paſs, this addition was not made?
" I will mention what occurs to me, and
" ſhall not be over ſollicitous about the
" weight that my reflexions may deſerve.
" If the doctrines of the immortality of
" the ſoul, and of a future ſtate, had
" been revealed to MOSES, that he might
" teach them to the Iſraelites, he would
" have taught them moſt certainly. But
" he did not teach them. They were

" there-

Digitized by Google

" therefore not revealed to him. Why
" they were not ſo revealed ſome PERT
" DIVINE or other will be ready to tell
" you. For me, I dare not preſume to
" gueſs. But this, I may preſume to ad-
" vance, that ſince theſe Doctrines were
" not revealed by God to his ſervant Mo-
" SES, it is highly probable that this Le-
" giſlator made a ſcruple of teaching them
" to the Iſraelites, how well ſoever in-
" ſtructed he might be in them himſelf,
" and howſoever uſeful to Government he
" might think them. The ſuperſtitions
" and idolatrous rites of the Egyptians,
" like thoſe of other nations, were found-
" ed on the Polytheiſm, and the Mytho-
" logy that prevailed, and were ſuffered
" to prevail, amongſt the Vulgar, and that
" made the ſum of their Religion. It
" ſeemed to be a point of policy to direct
" all theſe abſurd opinions and practices
" to the ſervice of Government, inſtead of
" attempting to root them out. But then
" the great difference between rude and
" ignorant nations, and ſuch as were ci-
" vilized and learned, like the Egyptians,
" ſeems to have been this, that the for-
" mer had no other ſyſtem of Religion
" than

Digitized by Google

" than theſe abſurd opinions and practices;
" whereas the latter had an inward as well
" as an outward Doctrine. There is rea-
" ſon to believe that natural Theology and
" natural Religion had been taught and
" practiſed in the ancient Theban Dyna-
" ſty; and it is probable that they conti-
" nued to be an *inward* doctrine in the
" reſt of Egypt, while Polytheiſm, Ido-
" latry, and all the MYSTERIES, all the
" impieties, and all the follies of Magic,
" were the *outward* doctrine. MOSES
" might be let into a knowledge of both;
" and under the patronage of the Princeſs,
" whoſe Foundling he was, he might be
" initiated into thoſe *Myſteries*, where the
" ſecret doctrine alone was taught, and
" the outward exploded. But we cannot
" imagine that the Children of Iſrael, in
" general, enjoyed the ſame privilege, nor
" that the Maſters were ſo laviſh, to their
" Slaves, of a favour ſo diſtinguiſhed, and
" often ſo hard to obtain. No. The
" Children of Iſrael knew nothing more
" than the outſide of the Religion of
" Egypt, and if the doctrine, we ſpeak of,
" was known to them, it was known
" only in the ſuperſtitious rites, and with

Digitized by Google

" all the fabulous circumſtances in which
" it was dreſſed up and preſented to vul-
" gar belief. It would have been hard
" therefore to teach, or to renew this
" Doctrine in the minds of the Iſraelites,
" without giving them an occaſion the
" more, to recall the polytheiſtical fables,
" and practice the idolatrous Rites they
" had learnt during their Captivity. Rites
" and Ceremonies are often ſo equivocal,
" that they may be applied to very differ-
" ent doctrines. But when they are ſo
" cloſely connected with one Doctrine
" that they are not applicable to another,
" to teach the Doctrine is, in ſome ſort, to
" teach the Rites and Ceremonies, and to
" authorize the fables on which they are
" founded. MOSES therefore being at
" liberty to teach this doctrine of rewards
" and puniſhments in a future ſtate, or
" not to teach it, might very well chooſe
" the latter; tho' he indulged the Iſraelites,
" on account of the hardneſs of their
" hearts, and by the divine permiſſion, as
" it is preſumed, in ſeveral obſervances
" and cuſtoms which did not lead directly,
" tho' even they did ſo perhaps in conſe-

Digitized by Google

" quence, to the Polytheiſm and Idolatry " of Egypt [6]."

What a Babel of reaſoning has his Lordſhip here heaped up, with the rubbiſh of falſe and inconſiſtent principles, only to inſult the Temple of God, and the Fortreſs of Mount Sion! Sometimes, he repreſents MOSES as a divine Meſſenger; and diſtinguiſhes between what was revealed, and what was not revealed, unto him; and then, *a future ſtate not being revealed to* MOSES *was the reaſon he did not teach it.* Sometimes again, he conſiders him as a mere human Lawgiver, acquiring all his knowledge of Religion and Politics from the Egyptians, in whoſe recondite Learning he had been intimately inſtructed; and then, the reaſon of the *omiſſion* is, *leſt the Doctrine of a future ſtate ſhould have drawn* the *Iſraelites into thoſe Egyptian ſuperſtitions*, from which, it was MOSES's purpoſe to ſet them free. All theſe inconſiſtencies in *Fact* and *Reaſoning*, his Lordſhip delivers in the ſame breath, and without the leaſt intimation of any change in his Principles or Opinions.

[6] Vol. v. p. 238---9—40—41.

Digitized by Google

But let us examine this wonderful Paragraph ſtep by ſtep, without troubling our heads about his Lordſhip's real ſentiments; it being indifferent, to this *View* of his talents, what he believed: It is ſufficient, that we confute all he ſays, whether under his own, or any other aſſumed Character.

He begins with owning, that ONE CANNOT SEE WITHOUT SURPRIZE, *a doctrine ſo uſeful to* ALL *Religions, and therefore incorporated into* ALL *the Syſtems of Paganiſm, left wholly out of that of the Jews.*

It ſeems then, that this OMISSION is, after all, no light or trivial matter, which may be accounted for by MOSES's *diſbelief* of the doctrine; his *ignorance*; or the *imaginary miſchiefs* it might produce. We may therefore be allowed to ſay, it deſerves the moſt ſerious attention: at leaſt, all the pains, the Author of the *Divine Legation of Moſes* has beſtowed upon it. And if the *Omiſſion* be ſo wonderful, a little *whimſical* reaſoning upon it, tho' it end in a demonſtration of the truth of Revelation, may be forgiven. And, if I might make ſo free with the delicacy of theſe times,

Digitized by Google

times, I would ſay, it is, on the whole, as well perhaps to be WHIMSICAL and conſiſtent, as even to be FASHIONABLE, when at the charge of Common Senſe.

His Lordſhip proceeds to ſhew, in direct oppoſition to what he ſaid before, that MOSES could not be ignorant of the doctrine of a future ſtate, becauſe the Egyptians taught it: His knowledge of it, (my Lord tells us) further appears from an *internal* circumſtance, *ſome of his rites ſeeming to allude, or to have a remote relation to, this very doctrine.* This I obſerve, to his Lordſhip's credit. The remark is accurate and fair. But we are in no want of his *remote relation*; I have ſhewn juſt above, that the jewiſh Laws againſt *Necromancy neceſſarily* imply Moſes's knowledge of the Doctrine.

His Lordſhip then goes on to explain the advantages, which, humanly ſpeaking, the Iſraelites muſt have received from this doctrine, in the temper and circumſtances, in which they left Egypt. MOSES, ſays he, *had to do with a rebellious and a ſuperſtitious People.*—This likewiſe, I obſerve, to his Lordſhip's credit, has the ſame marks of ſagacity and truth; and brings

Digitized by Google

us to the very verge of the *Solution*, propoſed by the Author of the *Divine Legation*; which is, that the Iſraelites were indeed under an *extraordinary Providence*, which ſupplied all the advantages that could be had from the doctrine of a *future ſtate*.

Under a *common and unequal* Providence, Religion cannot ſubſiſt without this doctrine: For Religion implying a juſt retribution of reward and puniſhment, which under ſuch a Providence is not diſpenſed, a *future ſtate* muſt needs ſubvene, to prevent the whole Edifice from falling into ruin. And thus we account for the *fact*, which his Lordſhip ſo amply acknowledges, viz. *that the doctrine of a future ſtate was moſt uſeful to* ALL *Religions, and therefore incorporated into* ALL *the Religions of Paganiſm.* But where an *extraordinary and equal* Providence is adminiſtered, good and evil are exactly diſtributed; and ſo, a future ſtate, in this circumſtance, is not neceſſary for the ſupport of Religion. A future ſtate is not to be found in the Moſaic Oeconomy; yet this Oeconomy ſubſiſted for many ages; Religion therefore did not

Digitized by Google

not need it; or, in other words, it was supported by an *extraordinary Providenc.*

This is the argument of the *Divine Legation.* Let us now conſider his Lordſhip's neweſt attempts to evade it.

Shall we ſay, that an Hypotheſis of future rewards and puniſhments was uſeleſs amongſt a people who lived under a THEOCRACY, *and that the future Judge of other People was their immediate Judge and King, who reſided in the midſt of them, and who dealed out rewards and puniſhments on every occaſion?* WHY THEN WERE SO MANY PRECAUTIONS *taken?* &c.

The PRECAUTIONS here objected to us, are to inſinuate *againſt the truth* of Moſes's Promiſe of an extraordinary Providence. A kind of SOPHISM which his Lordſhip only advances, and holds in common with the reſt, who have written againſt the *Divine Legation:* and which I ſhall here, after much forbearance on the Author's part, expoſe as it deſerves.

MOSES affirms again and again, that his People were under an extraordinary Providence. He affirms it indeed; but as it is not a ſelf evident truth, it wants to be proved: Till then, the *Unbeliever* is at

Digitized by Google

liberty to urge any circumſtance in the Jewiſh Law or Hiſtory, which may ſeem to bring the reality of that Providence into queſtion: The ſame liberty too, has the *Believer*; if at leaſt, he can perſuade himſelf (as they ſeem to have done, who have written againſt the *Divine Legation)* that his profeſſion will allow him to do it with decency. Things were in this ſtate, when the Author of the *Divine Legation* undertook the defenſe of MOSES: And to cut off at one ſtroke, all objections to the Legiſlator's credit, ariſing from any doubtful or unfavourable circumſtance in the Law or Hiſtory of the Jews, concerning this *extraordinary Providence*, he advanced the INTERNAL Argument of the OMISSION. By which he proved that an extraordinary Providence was, *in fact*, adminiſtred in the Jewiſh Republic. What change did this make in the ſtate of the caſe? It entirely altered it. *Unbelievers* were now indeed at liberty, and *Believers* too, if ſo perverſely diſpoſed, (which I am ſorry to ſay, they were) to oppoſe, and, as they could, to confute the Argument of the

Divine

Digitized by Google

Divine Legation: But by no rules of good Logic could they come over again with thoſe ſcripture difficulties to Moſes's credit, which the argument of the *Divine Legation* entirely obviated and continued to exclude, ſo long as that Argument remained unanſwered. For while a demonſtrated truth ſtands good, no difficulties, however inexplicable, have any weight againſt that ſuperior evidence. Not to admit of this fundamental maxim would be to unſettle many a *phyſical* and *mathematical* demonſtration, as well as this *moral* one.

I ſay therefore, as things now ſtand, To oppoſe difficulties againſt the adminiſtration of an *extraordinary Providence*, by reaſonings *a poſteriori*, after that providence has been *proved a priori*, and before the *proof* has been confuted, is the moſt palpable and barefaced impoſition on our underſtanding. In which however, his Lordſhip is but one of a hundred: and indeed, the moſt decent and conſiſtent of the hundred; as his *declared purpoſe* is to deſtroy the credit and authority of the Jewiſh Legiſlator.

We

Digitized by Google

We will not however decline to examine the weight of theſe Objections, tho' ſo fooliſhly and ſophiſtically urged.

If there was this *extraordinary* Providence adminiſtred, ſays his Lordſhip, *Why ſo many precautions taken? Why was a ſolemn covenant made with God as with a temporal Prince? Why were ſo many promiſes and threatnings of rewards and puniſhments, temporal indeed, but future and contingent, as we find, in the Book of Deuteronomy, moſt pathetically held out by Moſes?*

I will preſume to ſolve this difficulty. We find throughout, what *we* are wont to call, the *Hiſtory of Providence*, but what *his Lordſhip* is pleaſed to intitle, *Tales more extravagant than thoſe of Amadis de Gaule*, that God, in his moral Government of the World, always makes uſe of human means, as far as thoſe means will go; and never interpoſes with his *extraordinary* Providence, but when they will go no further. To do otherwiſe, would be to make an unneceſſary waſte of Miracles; better fitted to confound our knowledge of Nature, by obſcuring the harmony of order, than to manifeſt the

Digitized by Google

the Lord and Controller of it, by arreſting its delegated Powers. This method in God's moral Government, all our ideas of Wiſdom ſeem to ſupport. Now when He, the great Maſter of the Univerſe, had decreed to rule the Jewiſh People in an extraordinary way, he did not propoſe to ſuperſede any of the meaſures of civil regimen. And this, I hope, will be eſteemed a full anſwer to—WHY SO MANY PRECAUTIONS TAKEN, &c. But would you ſee it drawn out more at length, you may conſult the Author's *remarks* on the ſame kind of Sophiſtry employed by Dr. SYKES againſt the *Divine Legation.*

His Lordſhip goes on: *Would there have been any more impropriety in holding out thoſe of one kind than thoſe of another, becauſe the ſupreme Being, who diſpoſed and ordered both, was in a particular manner preſent amongſt them? Would an addition of rewards and puniſhments, more remote, but eternal, and in all reſpects far greater to the catalogue, have had no effect? I think neither of theſe things can be ſaid.*

His Lordſhip totally miſtakes the drift and deſign of the Author's Argument. The *Divine Legation* infers no more from the

Digitized by Google

the fact of the *omiſſion* than this, That the Jewiſh Oeconomy, adminiſtred by an *extraordinary* providence, could do without the ſervices of the *omitted* Doctrine; not, that that Doctrine, even under ſuch a Diſpenſation, was *of no uſe*, much leſs that it was IMPROPER.

But then one of his Followers, or, what is as good, one of the Adverſaries of the *Divine Legation*, will be ready to ſay, "If a *future ſtate* was not *improper*, much more if it was of *uſe*, under an extraordinary diſpenſation, How came MOSES not to give it?" For great and wiſe ends of Providence, vaſtly countervailing the uſe of that Doctrine, if you will believe the Author of the *Divine Legation*: Who, if he did not impoſe upon us, when he promiſed a *third* volume, (as his Lordſhip conſtantly believed, he did) will there explain thoſe *ends* at large.

Lord Bolingbroke proceeds next to tell us, what occurs to Him, concerning the REASONS of the *omiſſion*; And previouſly aſſures us, he is *not over ſolicitous about their weight*. This, I ſuppoſe, is to make his *Counters* paſs current: For then, as Hobbes expreſſes it, they become the *money of fools*, when

Digitized by Google

when we ceaſe to be *ſolicitous* about their worth; when we try them by their *colour*, not their *weight*; their Rhetoric, and not their Logic. But this muſt be ſaid with exception to the firſt, which is altogether logical, and very entertaining.

If (ſays his Lordſhip) *the doctrine of the immortality of the ſoul and a future ſtate had been revealed to* MOSES, *that he might teach them to the Iſraelites, he would have taught them moſt certainly. But he did not teach them. They were, therefore, not revealed.* It is in mood and figure, you ſee; and, I warrant you, deſigned to ſupply what was wanting in the *Divine Legation*; tho' as the Author of that book certainly believed, *the doctrines were not revealed*, 'tis ten to one but he thought Moſes not at liberty to teach them: unleſs you can ſuppoſe that his Lordſhip, who believed nothing of revelation, might believe Moſes to be reſtrained from teaching what God had not revealed to him; and yet, that the Author of the *Divine Legation*, who held Moſes's pretenſions to be true, might think him at liberty to go beyond his Commiſſion. Thus far, then, theſe two Writers

Digitized by Google

may be ſaid to agree: But this good underſtanding laſts not long. His Lordſhip's *modeſty* and the others *pertneſs* ſoon make the breach as wide as ever.—*Why they were not ſo revealed* (ſays his Lordſhip) *ſome* PERT DIVINE *or other will be ready to tell you. For me, I dare not pretend to gueſs.* The readineſs of the one and the backwardneſs of the other, are equally well ſuited to their reſpective principles. Should his Lordſhip have *gueſſed*, it muſt have brought him to what he moſt dreaded, the divine origin of the Jewiſh Religion: Had his Adverſary forborn to *gueſs*, he had betrayed his cauſe, and left thoſe *data* unemployed, which enabled him, I do not ſay to *gueſs*, but to diſcover, and demonſtrate the *Divine Legation of Moſes.*

However, *This*, his Lordſhip *will preſume to advance, that ſince theſe doctrines were not revealed by God to his ſervant* MOSES, *it is highly probable, that the Legiſlator made a ſcruple of teaching them to the Iſraelites, howſoever well inſtructed he might be in them himſelf, and howſoever uſeful to Government he might think them.* Was ever ſuch galimatias! And all for the miſerable pleaſure of depriving Religion of this

this illuſtrious evidence of its truth. He perſonates, you ſee, a Believer, who holds MOSES to be an inſpired Lawgiver: But how ill does he ſuſtain his part! Either MOSES did indeed receive the LAW from God, or he did not. If he did not, Why are we mocked with the diſtinction between what was revealed, and what was not revealed, when nothing was revealed? If MOSES did receive the *Law* from God, Why are we ſtill worſe mocked with the diſtinction between what was revealed, and what was not revealed, when every thing was revealed; as well, the direction for the *omiſſion of a future ſtate*, as the direction to *inculcate the Unity of the Godhead?* Why was all this mockery, you ſay? For an obvious purpoſe: it was to draw us from the TRUE object of our inquiry, which is, What GOD intended by the *omiſſion*; to that FANTASTIC object, which only reſpects, what MOSES intended by it. For the plain, obvious intention of GOD evinces the truth of *Moſes's miſſion*; but the intention of MOSES, when conſidered in contradiſtinction to God's, terminates in the human views of an ordinary Law-

Lawgiver; which leads us back again to Infidelity.

And now, having ſtript Moſes of his *divine*, and again inveſted him with his *civil* Character; his Lordſhip conſiders, What it was, which, under this character, might induce him to *omit a future ſtate*; and he finds it to be, leſt this doctrine ſhould have proved hurtful to the doctrine of the *Unity*, which it was his purpoſe to inculcate amongſt his People, in oppoſition to the Egyptian *Polytheiſm*.

Moſes, (ſays his Lordſhip) *it is highly probable, made a ſcruple of teaching theſe Doctrines to the Iſraelites, howſoever well inſtructed he might be in them, himſelf, and howſoever uſeful to Government he might think them. The People of Egypt, like all other nations, were Polytheiſts, but different from all others: there was in Egypt an inward as well as outward Doctrine: Natural Theology and natural Religion were the inward Doctrine; while Polytheiſm, Idolatry, and* ALL THE MYSTERIES, *all the impieties and follies of magic, were the* OUTWARD *Doctrine. Moſes was initiated into thoſe Myſteries*

Digitized by Google

Myſteries where the ſecret doctrine alone was taught, and the outward exploded——. For an accurate Divider commend me to his Lordſhip. In diſtinguiſhing between the *inward* and *outward* doctrines of the Egyptians, he puts *all the Myſteries* amongſt the *outward:* tho' if they had an *inward*, it muſt neceſſarily be part of thoſe *Myſteries*. But he makes amends preſently, (tho' his amends to truth is ever at the hazard of a contradiction) and ſays, that *Moſes learnt the inward doctrine in the Myſteries*. Let this paſs. He proceeds — *Moſes had the knowledge of both outward and inward. Not ſo the Iſraelites in general. They knew nothing more than the outſide of the Religion of Egypt. And if a future ſtate was known to them, it was known only in the ſuperſtitious rites, and with all the fabulous circumſtances, in which it was dreſſed up and preſented to the vulgar belief. It would be hard therefore to teach or to renew this doctrine in the minds of the Iſraelites, without giving them an occaſion the more to recal the Polytheiſtical fables, and practiſe the idolatrous rites they had learnt during their Captivity.* The Children of Iſrael, it ſeems, *knew no more of*

Digitized by Google

a future ſtate, than by the ſuperſtitious rites and fabulous circumſtances with which it was dreſſed up and preſented to the public belief. What then? MOSES, he owns, *knew more.* And what hindered MOSES from communicating of his knowledge to the People, when he took them under his protection, and gave them a new Law and a new Religion? His Lordſhip lets us underſtand, that this People knew as little of the *Unity*; for he tells us, it was amongſt the *inward* Doctrines of the Egyptians: Yet this did not hinder Moſes from inſtructing his people in the doctrine of the *Unity*. Why then ſhould it hinder his teaching them the *inward* doctrine of a *future ſtate*, diveſted of its fabulous circumſtances? He had diveſted *Religious worſhip* of the abſurdities of Demi-Gods and Heroes. What ſhould hinder him from diveſting a *future ſtate* of Charon's boat and the Elyſian fields? But the notion of a *future ſtate* would have recalled thoſe fabulous circumſtances which had been long connected with it. And would not *Religious worſhip*, under the idea of a tutelary Deity, and a temporal King, recal the polytheiſm of Egypt? Yet Moſes ventured upon

Digitized by Google

upon this inconvenience, for the ſake of great advantages. Why ſhould he not venture on the other, for the ſake of greater? For the doctrine of a future ſtate, is, as his Lordſhip confeſſes, even *neceſſary* both to civil and religious Society. But what does he talk of the danger of giving entry to the fables and ſuperſtitions concerning the ſoul; ſuperſtitions, which, tho' learnt in the Captivity, were common to all the nations of Polytheiſm, when, in other places, he aſſures us, that Moſes indulged the Iſraelites in the moſt characteriſtic ſuperſtitions of Egypt?

However, let us ſee how he ſupports this wiſe obſervation. *Rites and Ceremonies* (ſays his Lordſhip) *are often ſo equivocal, that they may be applied to very different doctrines. But when they are ſo cloſely connected with a doctrine, that they are not applicable to another, to teach the doctrine, is,* IN SOME SORT, *to teach the rites and ceremonies.*

In ſome ſort, is well put in, to ſoften the deformity of this inverted logic. His point is to ſhew, that a ſuperſtitious Rite, relating to, and dependent on, a certain Doctrine, will obtrude itſelf whenever that

Digitized by Google

Doctrine is taught: and his reaſoning is calculated to prove, that where the Rite is practiſed, the Doctrine will ſoon follow. But this does not hold in the reverſe, and the Rite follow the Doctrine; becauſe a Principal may ſtand without its Dependent; but a Dependent can never ſubſiſt without its Principal.

Under cover of theſe groteſque ſhapes, into which his Lordſhip has traveſtied the Jewiſh Lawgiver, he concludes, that MOSES *being* AT LIBERTY *to teach this doctrine of rewards and puniſhments in a future ſtate, or not to teach it, he might very well chuſe the latter* — Yet it was but at the beginning of this paragraph, that he tells us, *Moſes was* NOT AT LIBERTY *to teach, or not to teach.* His Lordſhip's words are theſe, *Since this doctrine was not revealed by God to his ſervant Moſes, it is highly probable that this Legiſlator* MADE A SCRUPLE *of teaching it.* But his Lordſhip knows that Stateſmen ſoon get the better of their *ſcruples:* and then, by another fetch of political caſuiſtry, find themſelves more at liberty than ever.

I had obſerved above, that our noble Diſcourſer, who makes MOSES ſo *ſcrupulous* that

Digitized by Google

that he would, on no terms, afford a handle for one ſingle Egyptian ſuperſtition to get footing amongſt his people; has, on other occaſions, charged him with introducing them by wholeſale. He was ſenſible his Inconſiſtency was likely to be detected, and therefore he now attempts to obviate it.—*Tho' he* [Moſes] *indulged the Iſraelites, on account of the hardneſs of their hearts, and by the divine permiſſion, as it is preſumed, in ſeveral obſervations and cuſtoms, which did not* LEAD *directly, tho' even they did ſo perhaps* IN CONSEQUENCE, *to the Polytheiſm and Idolatry of Egypt.* And could teaching the Doctrine of a *future ſtate* poſſibly do any more than LEAD IN CONSEQUENCE, (as his Lordſhip elegantly expreſſes it) *to the Polytheiſm and Idolatry of Egypt*, by drawing after it thoſe *ſuperſtitious Rites and fabulous circumſtances* which, he tells us, then attended the popular notion of ſuch a State? If, for the *hardneſs of their hearts*, they were indulged in *ſeveral obſervances and cuſtoms*, which only *led in conſequence* to Polytheiſm and Idolatry, Why, for the *ſame* hardneſs of heart, were they not indulged with the doctrine of a *future ſtate*, which did not

Digitized by Google

lead, but by a very remote conſequence, to Polytheiſm and Idolatry? Eſpecially ſince this *hardneſs of heart* would leſs bear the denial of a DOCTRINE ſo alluring to the human mind, than the denial of a RITE, to which, habit only and old cuſtom had given a caſual propenſity. Again, thoſe *Rites*, indulged to the People, for the *hardneſs of their hearts*, had in themſelves little uſe, or tendency to advance the ends of the Jewiſh Diſpenſation; but rather retarded them: Whereas a *future ſtate*, by his Lordſhip's own confeſſion, is moſt uſeful to all Religions, and therefore incorporated into all the Syſtems of Paganiſm; and was particularly uſeful to the Iſraelites, who were, he ſays, both a *rebellious* and a *ſuperſtitious* people: diſpoſitions, which not only made it neceſſary to omit nothing that might inforce obedience, but likewiſe facilitated the reception and ſupported the influence of the doctrine in queſtion.

You have here the whole of his Lordſhip's boaſted ſolution of this important Circumſtance of the OMISSION. And you ſee how vainly he ſtrives to elude its force. Overwhelmed, as it were, with the

Digitized by Google

the weight of ſo irreſiſtible a Power, after long wriggling to get free, he at length crawls forth, but ſo maimed and broken, that all his remaining ſtrength is in his venom; which he now ſheds in abundance over the whole Moſaic Oeconomy; It is pronounced to be a groſs impoſture; and this very circumſtance of the OMISSION is given as the undoubted proof of his accuſation.

— "Can we be ſurpriſed then (ſays his "Lordſhip) that the Jews aſcribed to the "all perfect Being, on various occaſions, "ſuch a conduct and ſuch Laws as are "inconſiſtent with his moſt obvious per-"fections? Can we believe ſuch a con-"duct and ſuch Laws to have been his, "on the word of the proudeſt and moſt "lying Nation in the world? Many other "conſiderations might have their place "here. But I ſhall confine myſelf to "one; *which I do not remember to have ſeen "nor heard urged on one ſide, nor* ANTI-"CIPATED *on the other.* To ſhew then, "the more evidently, how ABSURD, as "well as IMPIOUS it is to aſcribe theſe "Moſaical Laws to God, let it be conſi-"dered, that NEITHER the people of

Digitized by Google

" Iſrael, nor their Legiſlator perhaps,
" KNEW ANY THING OF ANOTHER LIFE,
" wherein the crimes committed in this
" life are to be puniſhed. Altho' he
" might have learned this Doctrine, which
" was not ſo much a ſecret doctrine as it
" may be preſumed that the unity of
" the ſupreme God was, amongſt the
" Egyptians. Whether he had learned
" both, or either, or neither of them in
" thoſe ſchools, cannot be determined:
" BUT THIS MAY BE ADVANCED WITH
" ASSURANCE; If MOSES knew, that
" crimes, and therefore Idolatry, one of
" the greateſt, were to be puniſhed in
" another life, he deceived the people in
" the Covenant they made, by his inter-
" vention, with God. If he did not know
" it, I ſay it with horror, the conſe-
" quence, *according to the hypotheſis I op-*
" *poſe*, muſt be, that God deceived both
" him and them. In either caſe, a co-
" venant or bargain was made, wherein,
" the conditions of obedience and diſobe-
" dience were not fully, nor by conſe-
" quence, fairly ſtated. The Iſraelites
" had better things to hope, and worſe
" to fear, than thoſe which were expreſſed

" in

Digitized by Google

" in it: and their whole hiſtory ſeems to " ſhew how much need they had of theſe " additional motives to reſtrain them from " Polytheiſm and Idolatry, and to anſwer " the aſſumed Purpoſes of divine Provi- " dence [7]."

This wonderful Argument, his Lordſhip ſays, he does *not remember to have ſeen, or heard urged on one ſide, nor anticipated on the other.* This, You are to underſtand as a kind reproof to the Author of the *Divine Legation:* for none but He, I think, could *anticipate* an objection to an Argument which none but He had employed. Give me leave then to *ſupply* his defects: I am the firſt good natured Animadverter on him that has done ſo; the reſt have contented themſelves with their beſt endeavours to *expoſe* them. However, had the Author of the *Divine Legation* been aware of the Objection, it is ten to one but he had done his beſt to *anticipate* it. But as his Lordſhip is ſo generous to invite an anſwer to it, he ſhall not be diſappointed.

Let it be conſidered (ſays his Lordſhip)

[7] Vol. v. p. 194—5.

Digitized by Google

that perhaps Moſes KNEW NOTHING *of another life, wherein the crimes committed in this life are to be puniſhed.* — *Conſidered* by whom? Not by his Lordſhip, or his kind Readers: for he has brought them to *conſider* the contrary. " Many probable " reaſons (ſays he) might be brought to " ſhew, that this was an Egyptian doctrine " *before the exode*; and this particularly, that " it was propagated from Egypt, ſo ſoon " at leaſt afterwards, *by all thoſe who were* " *inſtructed* LIKE Moses, in the wiſdom " of that People. He tranſported much of " this wiſdom into the ſcheme of Reli- " gion and Government which he gave " the Iſraelites; and, among other things, " certain Rites, which SEEM TO ALLUDE, " OR HAVE A REMOTE RELATION TO, " THIS DOCTRINE [8]." This poſſibly might have recurred to his Lordſhip, while he was talking of this new and *unanticipated* argument, and therefore, in the tricking it up amongſt his *Fragments*, to his *perhaps*, he adds, by a very happy corrective, *altho' Moſes might have learnt this Doctrine, which* WAS NOT SO

[8] Vol. v. p. 238—9.

MUCH

Digitized by Google

MUCH A SECRET *doctrine, as it may be preſumed that the unity of the ſupreme God was amongſt the Egyptians.* But he had done better to have left his contradictions uncorrected, and have truſted to the rare ſagacity of the Public to find them out. For he had ever an ill hand at reconciling matters; thus in the caſe before us, in the very act of covering one contradiction, he commits another. He is here ſpeaking of a *future ſtate*, diveſted of its fabulous circumſtances; *Perhaps*, ſays he, MOSES KNEW NOTHING OF ANOTHER LIFE. *Which, was* NOT SO MUCH A SECRET *doctrine, as that of the Unity.* Now, Sir, turn back a moment, to the long quotation from his 239th page, and there you will find, that a future ſtate, diveſted of its fabulous circumſtances, WAS AS MUCH A SECRET *Doctrine, as that of the Unity.*—" There is reaſon to believe, " that natural Theology and natural Re- " ligion were INWARD doctrines amongſt " the Egyptians. MOSES might be let " into a knowledge of BOTH by being " initiated into thoſe *Myſteries* where the " *ſecret* doctrine alone was taught. But " we cannot imagine, that the Children of " Iſrael in general enjoyed the ſame pri-

Digitized by Google

" vilege. No, *they knew nothing more* " *than the outside* of the Egyptian Reli- " gion: and if the *Doctrine we speak of* " [A FUTURE STATE] was known to " them, it was known only in the super- " stitious Rites, and with all the fabulous " circumstances, in which it was dressed " up and presented to vulgar belief."— Is not this, now, a plain declaration, that a *future state*, divested of its fabulous circumstances, *was as much a secret Doctrine as the doctrine of the Unity?*

But his Lordship's contradictions are the least of my concern. It is his Argument I have now to do with. And this, he says, he *advances* WITH ASSURANCE. I agree with him: It is that which adds a relish to all he advances.

He thinks he can reduce those who hold the hypothesis of no future state in the Jewish Oeconomy, to the necessity of owning, that MOSES, *or that* GOD *himself*, *acted unfairly by the Israelites*. How so, You ask? Because One or Other of them concealed a *future state*. And what if they did? Why then they concealed one of the actual Sanctions of moral conduct, *future punishment*. But who told him, that this, which was no sanction of the *Jewish Law*,

Digitized by Google

Law, was a ſanction to the moral conduct of the *Jewiſh People?* Who, unleſs the *artificial Theologer?* the man he moſt decries and deſpiſes.

In all this ſort of *Theology*, there being nothing but the CALVINISTICAL tenet of *Original Sin*, that gives the leaſt countenance to ſo monſtrous an opinion, every thing in the GOSPEL, every thing in NATURAL THEOLOGY exclaims againſt it.

JESUS, indeed, to prove that the departed Iſraelites ſtill exiſted, quotes the title God was pleaſed to give himſelf, of *the God of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob*; which, together with their *exiſtence*, proves likewiſe the *happineſs* of their condition: for the relation they are ſaid to ſtand in with God, ſhews them to be of his kingdom. But we muſt remember, that the queſtion with his Lordſhip is, not of *reward*, but *puniſhment*. Again, JESUS informs us, in a parable indeed, that the deceaſed *rich man* was *in a place of torment*. But we muſt remember that the ſcene was laid at a time when the Doctrine of a *future ſtate* was become national. To know our bleſſed Maſter's ſentiments on the abſtract queſtion of *ſubjection to an unknown*

Digitized by Google

known Sanction, we may conſider the following words, "The ſervant which knew "his Lord's will, and prepared not himſelf, neither did according to his will, "ſhall be beaten with many ſtripes; but "he that knew not, and did commit things "worthy of ſtripes, ſhall be beaten with "few ſtripes [8]." Now the Will of a Maſter or Sovereign, declared in his Laws, always includes in it, the *Sanctions* of thoſe Laws. The Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* expreſly diſtinguiſhes the ſanction of the Jewiſh law from that of the Goſpel; and makes the diſtinction to conſiſt in this, that the one was of *temporal* puniſhments, and the other of *future*. *He that deſpiſed Moſes's Law died without mercy under two or three witneſſes. Of how much ſorer puniſhment, ſuppoſe ye, ſhall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God* [9]? Which appeal is without common ſenſe or honeſty, on ſuppoſition that the apoſtle held the Jews to be ſubject to *future* puniſhments, before that Sanction was promulged unto them. From the GOSPEL therefore, it cannot be inferred, that the Iſraelites, while only following the Law of Moſes, in which the ſanction of a *future ſtate* is

[8] Luke xii. p. 47—8. [9] C. x. ℣ 28—9.

 omitted,

Digitized by Google

omitted, were liable or ſubject to the puniſhments of that ſtate.

Let us ſee next, Whether NATURAL THEOLOGY, or *natural Religion* (as his Lordſhip is pleaſed, for ſome reaſon or other, to diſtinguiſh the terms) hath taught us, that a people, living under an EQUAL PROVIDENCE, or the immediate government of God, to whom he hath given a Law and revealed a Religion, both ſupported by *temporal* ſanctions only, can be deemed ſubject to thoſe *future* puniſhments, unknown to them, which *natural* Religion before, and *Revealed* Religion ſince, have diſcovered to be due to bad men living under an UNEQUAL PROVIDENCE.

NATURAL RELIGION ſtandeth, (as has been already ſhewn) on this Principle, "that the Governor of the Univerſe REWARDS and PUNISHES moral Agents." The length or ſhortneſs of human exiſtence come not primarily into the idea of Religion; not even into that compleat idea of Religion delivered by St. Paul, in his general definition of it. The Religioniſt, ſays he, *muſt believe that God is, and that he* IS A REWARDER *of thoſe who ſeek him.*

While

Digitized by Google

While God exactly distributed his rewards and punishments here, the light of Nature directed men to look no further for the Sanctions of his Laws. But when it came to be seen, that He was *not always* a rewarder and a punisher *here*, men necessarily concluded, from his moral attributes, that he would be both, *hereafter*; and consequently, that this life was but a small portion of human duration. They had not yet speculated on the permanent nature of the Soul. And when they did so, that consideration, which, under an *unequal* providence came strongly in aid of the *moral argument* for another life, had no tendency, under an *equal* one, to open to them the prospects of *futurity*: because, tho' they saw the Soul unaffected by those causes which brought the body to dissolution, yet they held it to be equally dependent for its existence, on the Creator's Will; who, amongst the various means of its destruction, of which they had no conception, had, for aught they knew, provided one or more for that purpose.

Thus a FUTURE STATE was brought, by natural light, into Religion: and from thence

thenceforth, under this unequal diſtribution of things, became a neceſſary part of Religion. But, in the Jewiſh THEOCRACY, God was an exact rewarder and puniſher, *here*. Natural light therefore ſhewed that, under ſuch an adminiſtration, the ſubjects of it did not become liable to future Puniſhments, till that ſanction was known amongſt them.—And this, which Natural Religion teaches, we may be ſure God, who conſtituted *natural* as well as *revealed* Religion, will confirm.

Thus we learn by the Principles of the *Goſpel*, and of the *Religion of Nature*, that his Lordſhip calumniated both, when he affirmed, that, on the hypotheſis in queſtion, MOSES *Deceived the people in the Covenant they made, by his intervention, with God: Or that, if Moſes did not know the doctrine of a future ſtate, then* GOD *deceived both him and them.*

Should it now be aſked, how God will deal with wicked men, thus dying under the Moſaic Diſpenſation? give me leave to anſwer, in the words of Dr. CLARKE, to as impertinent a queſtion. He had demonſtrated a ſelf-moving Subſtance to be immaterial, and ſo, not periſhable like

Digitized by Google

Bodies. This including the Souls of irrational animals, it was aſked "How theſe were to be diſpoſed of, when they had left their reſpective habitations?" To which the Doctor very properly replies, "Certainly, the omnipotent and infinitely "wiſe God may, without any great diffi- "culty, be ſuppoſed to have more ways "of diſpoſing of his Creatures [I add, with perfect juſtice and equity, and with equal meaſure, to all] "than we are, at preſent, "let into the ſecret of[1]." But if the Author of the *Divine Legation*, has not promiſed more than he can perform (as his long delay gives us too much room to ſuſpect) this matter will be explained at large, in his account of the SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF THE REDEMPTION, which, he has told us, is to have a place in his laſt Volume.

Nothing, then, remains of this objection but the ſanction of *future rewards:* And I would by no means deprive the faithful Iſraelites of theſe. So that his Lordſhip has this to make his beſt of. And, in his opinion, even an unexpected *reward*,

[1] Octavo Tracts againſt Dodwell and Collins, p. 103.

is

is *unfair* dealing; for he joins it with *puniſhment*, as if his conſequence againſt God's juſtice and goodneſs might be equally deduced from either of them. — *A covenant*, ſays he, *was made, wherein the conditions of obedience and diſobedience were not* FULLY, *nor, by conſequence,* FAIRLY *ſtated. The Iſraelites had* BETTER THINGS TO HOPE, *and worſe to fear than thoſe which were expreſſed in it.* Tho' it be hard on the *Benefactor*, to be denied the liberty of giving more than what, in his Covenant, he had expreſsly promiſed; it is ſtill harder on the Party *obliged*, that he is not at liberty to receive more. True it is, that, in this caſe, the *conditions* are not FULLY *ſtated*; and therefore, according to his Lordſhip's Logic, BY CONSEQUENCE, NOT FAIRLY. To ſtrengthen this *Conſequence*, his Lordſhip concludes in theſe words—*And their whole Hiſtory ſeems to ſhew how much need they had of theſe additional motives* [future Rewards and Puniſhments] *to reſtrain them from Polytheiſm and Idolatry, and to anſwer the* ASSUMED *purpoſes of Divine Providence.*

Whoever attentively reflects upon all theſe conceſſions together — That Moſes was

Digitized by Google

himſelf of the race of Iſrael — was learned in all the wiſdom of Egypt — and capable of freeing his People from their Yoke — that he brought them within ſight of the promiſed Land; a fertile Country, which they were to conquer and inhabit — that he inſtituted a ſyſtem of Laws, which has been the admiration of the wiſeſt men of all ages — that he underſtood the doctrine of a FUTURE STATE: and by his experience gained in Egypt, knew the efficacy of it in general; and by his perfect knowledge of the rebellious and ſuperſtitious temper of his own People, could not but ſee how uſeful it was to them in particular — Whoever, I ſay, reflects on all theſe things (and all theſe things are amongſt his Lordſhip's conceſſions) and at the ſame time conſiders, that MOSES, throughout his whole ſyſtem of Law and Religion, is entirely ſilent concerning a *future ſtate* of Rewards and Puniſhments, will, I believe, conclude, that there was ſomething more in the OMISSION than Lord BOLINGBROKE could fathom, or, at leaſt, was willing to find.

But let us turn from MOSES's conduct, (which will be elſewhere conſidered at large)

Digitized by Google

large) to his Lordſhip's, which is our preſent buſineſs. Firſt, he gives us his conjectures, to account for the *Omiſſion*, excluſively of MOSES's *Divine Legation*: but, as if diſſatisfied with them himſelf (which he well might be, for they deſtroy one another) he next attempts, you ſee, to prove, that the *Legation* could not be *divine*, from this very circumſtance of the *omiſſion*. And now at laſt he will demonſtrate that an *extraordinary providence*, in general, ſuch a one as is repreſented by Moſes, and which, the Author of the *Divine Legation* has proved, from the circumſtance of the *omiſſion*, was *actually* adminiſtered in the Jewiſh Republic, could not poſſibly be adminiſtered, without deſtroying free will; without making Virtue ſervile; and without relaxing univerſal benevolence. And, to make all ſure, he ſhuts up the account by ſhewing, that an *extraordinary* providence could anſwer no reaſonable end or purpoſe.

In his *firſt order* of evaſions, he ſeems to be alone; but in the *ſecond* and *third*, he had the pleaſure of ſeeing in coadjutorſhip with him, many an orthodox Writer againſt the *Divine Legation*.

Digitized by Google

I have conſidered his Lordſhip's *firſt* and *ſecond order*. The *third* remains to be examined: it is the laſt refuge of his infidelity: And then, I think, I may return him back to the Author of the *Divine Legation*, in caſe he chuſes to take him up, in defence of the other principles of his book; all of which, with diſtinguiſhed honour to this Writer above any other, his Lordſhip has attempted, to confute at large.

1. His firſt objection to the adminiſtration of an extraordinary providence, ſuch as MOSES promiſed to his People on the part of GOD, is, that it would DESTROY FREE-WILL. But here let me obſerve, that he affects to diſguiſe the immediate Object of his attack; and, in arguing againſt an extraordinary Providence, chuſes to conſider it in the abſtract, as the Point ariſes out of an imaginary diſpute between Him and the Divines; who, he pretends, are diſſatisfied with the preſent order of things, and require, as the terms of their acquieſcence in God's juſtice, the adminiſtration of an *equal Providence, here*. But, this obliquity in diſguiſing the true object of his attack,

attack, not being of itſelf ſufficient to embarras his adverſaries, he further ſupports it by a prevarication: For it is not true, that Divines are diſſatisfied with the preſent order of things, or that they require a better. All the ground they ever gave his Lordſhip for imputing this ſcandal to them, being only this aſſertion, "That if the preſent ſtate be the whole of Man's exiſtence, then the Juſtice of God would have exactly diſpenſed good and evil *here*: but, as he has not ſo diſpenſed them, it follows, that there will be a ſtate of rewards and puniſhments *hereafter*."

This being premiſed, I proceed to his firſt objection: — "In good earneſt (ſays "his Lordſhip) is a ſyſtem of particular "providences, in which the ſupreme Be-"ing, or his Angels, like his Miniſters to "reward, and his Executioners to puniſh, "are conſtantly employed in the affairs "of mankind, much more reaſonable?" [than the *Gods* of EPICURUS or the *morals* of POLEMO] "Would the JUSTICE of "God be more MANIFEST in ſuch a ſtate "of things than in the preſent? I ſee "no room for MERIT on the part of

" Man, nor for JUSTICE on the part of " God, in ſuch a ſtate [2]."

His Lordſhip aſks, *whether the Juſtice of God would be more manifeſt* in ſuch a ſtate of things, where good is conſtantly diſpenſed to the virtuous, and evil to the wicked, *than in the preſent*, where good and evil happen indifferently to all men? If his Lordſhip, by *the preſent ſtate of things*, includes the rectification of them in a *future ſtate*, I anſwer, that *the juſtice of God would not be more* manifeſt, but equally and fully manifeſt in both caſes. If his Lordſhip does not include this rectification in a *future ſtate*, then I anſwer his queſtion by another; Would the Juſtice of the Civil Magiſtrate be more manifeſt, where he exactly diſpenſes rewards to good men, and puniſhment to evil, than where he ſuffers the Cunning and the Powerful to carve for themſelves?

But *he ſees no room for merit on the part of Man, or Juſtice on the part of God.* If he does not ſee, it is his own fault. It is owing to his prevaricating both with himſelf and his Reader; to the turning his view

[2] Vol. v. p. 425—6.

from

Digitized by Google

from the Scripture-repreſentation of an equal Providence, to the partialities of Fanatics concerning the favoured workings of the Spirit, and to the injuſtices of Calviniſtical election; and to his giving theſe to the reader, in its ſtead. See how dextrouſly he ſlides *Enthuſiaſm* and *Predeſtination* into the Scripture-doctrine of an equal Providence.—*If ſome men were* DETERMINED TO GOODNESS *by the ſecret workings of the Spirit*, &c. Yes indeed, if you will be pleaſed to allow him, that, under an equal providence, the *will is over-ruled*, you muſt be forced to allow him there is an end of all merit and demerit. But this ſubſtituting, what he calls *artificial theology* in the place of *bible-theology*, is his uſual leger-de-main. So again, *I can conceive ſtill leſs, that individual Creatures before they have done either good or evil, nay, before their actual exiſtence, can be the objects of predilection or averſion, of love or hatred to God.* I believe, every Goſpel-Divine conceives as little of this as himſelf; and as much of the conſequence of ſuch a ſyſtem, *viz.* that it violates *God's juſtice*. But what have theſe human inventions to do with the *extraordinary Providence*, repreſented in

Digitized by Google

in holy Writ? To ſay, that this Providence takes away man's merit and God's juſtice, is confounding all our ideas of right and wrong. Is it not the higheſt merit of a rational creature to comply with the ſtrongeſt motive? And is not God's juſtice then moſt manifeſt when the order of things preſent feweſt difficulties and obſcurities in our contemplation of it? His Lordſhip was plainly of theſe ſentiments, when, arguing againſt God's compliance with the Jewiſh *hardneſs of heart*, he thought it more becoming the Maſter of the Univerſe, to bend the perverſe ſtiffneſs of their Wills; and, when, arguing againſt a *future ſtate* from the preſent good order of things, he pretends to ſhew, *againſt Divines and Atheiſts in conjunction*, that there was little or no irregularity in the preſent diſpenſations of Providence; at leaſt, not ſo much as the the World commonly imagined. And why was this paradox advanced, but from a conſciouſneſs that the more exact the preſent adminiſtration of God's providence appeared, the more manifeſt it made his Juſtice? But here his Lordſhip's followers may put in, and ſay, that their

Digitized by Google

Maſter has in this, done no more, (indeed ſcarce ſo much, at leaſt, not in ſo expreſs terms) than a celebrated Prelate, in one of his *diſcourſes* at the *Temple*; who tells us, "That an immediate and viſible "interpoſition of Providence in Behalf of "the righteous, and for the puniſhment of "the wicked, would INTERFERE WITH "THE FREEDOM OF MORAL AGENTS, "AND NOT LEAVE ROOM FOR THEIR "TRYAL [3]." But they who object this, to us, have not conſidered the nature of moral differences. For, as another learned Prelate well obſerves, *A little experience may convince us, that the ſame thing, at different times, is not the ſame* [4]. Now if *different times* may make ſuch alterations in identity, what muſt *different men* do? The *thing ſaid*, being by all candid interpretation, to be regulated on the *purpoſe of ſaying*.

2. Lord Bolingbroke's ſecond objection againſt an equal Providence is, that it would MAKE VIRTUE, SERVILE.—"If "the Good, beſides the enjoyment of

[3] Vol. ii. p. 258—9.

[4] *Scripture vindicated from the miſrepreſentations of the Bp. of Bangor*, p. 165.

"all

Digitized by Google

" all that happineſs which is inſeparable
" from Virtue, were exempted from all
" kinds of evil, and if the wicked, be-
" ſides all thoſe evils which are inſe-
" parable from Vice, and thoſe which
" happen to all men in the ordinary
" courſe of events, were expoſed to
" others that the hand of God inflicted on
" them in an extraordinary manner, ſuch
" Good men would have VERY LITTLE
" MERIT; they would have, while they
" continued to be good, no other merit
" than that of children who are cajoled
" into their duty; or than that of Gally-
" ſlaves who ply at the oar, becauſe
" they hear and ſee and fear the laſh of
" the boat-ſwain [5]."

If the perfection of a rational Creature conſiſts in acting according to reaſon; and if his merit riſes in proportion to his advances in perfection; How can that ſtate which beſt ſecures him from acting irrationally, leſſen or take away his merit? Are the actions of the Deity of leſs worth for the moral incapacity of his being unjuſt or malignant? The motive which induces to right action is indeed more or

[5] Vol. v. p. 428.

leſs

Digitized by Google

leſs perfect according to the dignity or nature of the Agent: But the queſtion here is not concerning the *perfection*, but the *power* of the motive, in turning action into paſſion; which is the only way whereby it can deſtroy *merit* in its ſubject. Now I hold that this fancy, That motives exterior to the Being on which they work, can turn an Agent to a Patient, is one of the greateſt of Phyſical abſurdities. For while agency remains, merit ſubſiſts: the degrees of which do not depend on the leſs or greater force of the motives, but on the more or leſs reaſon of the choice. In a word, there is no other means of taking away the merit and demerit of human actions, than by taking away agency, and making man paſſive, or, in other terms, a Machine.

But to ſhew, in a more popular way, the futility of this reaſoning, it will be ſufficient to obſerve, that the objection holds equally againſt all religious Sanctions whatſoever. And ſo indeed it was frankly urged by Lord Shaftſbury; who pretended that every motive regarding SELF, tended to ſervilize Virtue: Without doubt, one ſort, juſt as much as another; a *future*

Digitized by Google

ture ſtate, as well as an *equal Providence*. Nay, if we were to appreciate matters very nicely, it would ſeem, that *a future ſtate without an equal providence* (for they are alway to be conſidered ſeparately, as they belong to different ſyſtems) would more ſtrongly incline the Will, than *an equal providence without a future ſtate*; as the difference between *future* and *preſent* good, is infinitely great. But the human mind being ſo conſtituted, that the *diſtance* of a good takes off proportionably from its influence, this will bring the force of the two ſanctions nearer to an equality; which proves thus much, and no more, That the objection to the *merit of Virtue* holds, as we ſaid, againſt all religious ſanctions whatever. In the uſe of which, Lord Shaftſbury was not only more ingenuous, who urged it againſt them *all*, but more conſiſtent, as he urged it on his principle of a perfect *diſintereſtedneſs* in our nature; whereas Lord Bolingbroke is amongſt thoſe who hold, that *ſelf-love* and *ſocial*, tho' coincident, are two eſſential paſſions in the human frame.

" That two conſiſtent motions act the Soul,
" And one regards ITSELF, and one the
" WHOLE.

But

Digitized by Google

But we might go further, and urge againſt both theſe noble Adverſaries of Religion, that the charge of *making virtue ſervile*, holds againſt all *moral* ſanctions likewiſe, as well as againſt all *religious*; as well againſt that whoſe exiſtence they allow, as againſt thoſe which they would perſuade us to be viſionary; both theſe illuſtrious Patrons of infidelity maintaining, that *God has made the practice of virtue our* INTEREST *as well as duty* [4]. But *intereſt* and *ſervility* is, with theſe generous Spirits, the ſame thing.

His Lordſhip's third cavil to an equal Providence is, that it would RELAX GENERAL BENEVOLENCE.

—"But would there not be, at the "ſame time, ſome further defects in this "ſcheme? I think there would. It ſeems "to me, that theſe good men being thus "diſtinguiſhed by particular providences, "in their favour, from the reſt of man-"kind, might be apt either not to con-"tract, or to LOSE THAT GENERAL "BENEVOLENCE, which is a fundamental "Principle of the Law of Nature, and "that PUBLIC SPIRIT, which is the life

[4] Vol. v. p. 429.

"and

" and ſoul of Society. God has made the
" practice of morality our intereſt, as well
" as our duty. But men who found
" themſelves conſtantly protected from the
" evils that fell on others, might grow
" inſenſibly to think themſelves uncon-
" cerned in the common fate: and if they
" relaxed in their zeal for the Public
" good, they would relax in their virtue;
" for public good is the object of Virtue.
" They might do worſe, ſpiritual pride
" might infect them. They might be-
" come in their own imaginations the little
" Flock, or the choſen Sheep. Others
" have been ſo by the mere force of En-
" thuſiaſm, without any ſuch inducements
" as thoſe which we aſſume, in the ſame
" caſe; and experience has ſhewn, that there
" are no Wolves like theſe Sheep [5]."

The *caſe aſſumed*, to which his Lordſhip objects, and againſt which he pretends to argue, is, that of an *equal Providence which exactly diſtributes good to Virtue, and to Vice, evil.* Now the preſent objection to ſuch a ſtate is, an' pleaſe you, that this *favourable diſtinction* of good, to the virtuous man would be apt to *deſtroy*

[5] Vol. v. p. 429.

his

Digitized by Google

his general benevolence and public ſpirit. Theſe, in his Lordſhip's account, and ſo in mine too, are the ſublimeſt Virtues; and therefore, it is agreed will be moſt highly rewarded: But the tendency of this *favourable diſtinction*, if you will believe him, may prove *the loſs of general benevolence and public ſpirit.* As much as this ſhocks common ſenſe, his Lordſhip has his reaſons. *God has made the practice of morality our* INTEREST *as well as duty. But men, who find themſelves conſtantly protected from the evils that fall on others, might grow inſenſibly to think themſelves unconcerned in the common fate.*

God has made the practice of morality our INTEREST *as well as duty.* Without doubt he has. But does it not continue to be our *intereſt*, under an *equal*, as well as under an *unequal* Providence? Nay, is it not more evidently and invariably ſo, in the abſence of thoſe *inequalities* which hinder our ſeeing clearly, and feeling conſtantly, that *the practice of morality is our* INTEREST *as well as duty?*

—*But men, who found themſelves conſtantly protected from the evils that fall on*

others, might grow inſenſibly to think themſelves unconcerned in the COMMON FATE. What are thoſe *evils*, under an *equal* Providence, which *fall on others*, and from which the good man is *protected?* Are they not the puniſhments inflicted on the wicked. And how is the good man protected from them? Is it not by his perſeverance in Virtue? Is it poſſible therefore, he ſhould grow inſenſible to thoſe evils, which his Lordſhip calls the *common fate*, when he ſees his *intereſt*, and his duty ſo cloſely connected, that there is no way to avoid thoſe evils but by perſevering in virtue? But his Lordſhip by calling them the *common fate* detects his prevarication. In this reaſoning againſt an *equal Providence*, he ſlurs in upon us, in its ſtead, a *Providence which only protects good men; or rather, one certain ſpecies of good men; and leaves all other to their* COMMON FATE. But admit it poſſible for the good man to *relax in his benevolence, and to grow inſenſible to the common fate:* there is, in *the ſtate here aſſumed*, a ſpeedy means of bringing him to himſelf; and that is, his being no longer *protected from the evils that fall*

Digitized by Google

fall on others: for when men *relax in their benevolence*, his Lordſhip tells us, *they relax in their virtue:* and, give me leave to tell his Lordſhip, that when men relax in their virtue, Providence relaxes in its protection; or, to ſpeak more properly, the rewards of virtue are abated in proportion.

However, *ſpiritual pride* (he ſays) *might infect the virtuous, thus protected.* And this he will prove *a fortiori*, from the caſe of ENTHUSIASTS; who only imagine they have this protection, and have it not. Now, what if we ſhould ſay, that this very *enthuſiaſtic ſpirit* itſelf, and not the viſions of *Protection* it is apt to raiſe, is the true cauſe of *ſpiritual pride?*

ENTHUSIASM is that temper of mind, in which the *imagination* has got the better of the *judgment*. In this inverted ſtate of things, *Enthuſiaſm*, when it happens to be turned upon religious matters, becomes FANATICISM: which, in it's extreme, begets this fancy of our being the peculiar favorites of Heaven. Now, every one ſees, that SPIRITUAL PRIDE is the *cauſe*, and not the *effect* of the diſorder. For what but *ſpiritual pride*, ſpringing

Digitized by Google

out of preſumptive holineſs, could bring the Fanatic to fancy himſelf exalted above the common condition of the faithful? It is true, when he was got thus far, the folly which brought him thither, would be greatly inflamed; and this addition would be indeed the *effect* of his diſorder. For, as the real communication of Grace purifies the paſſions, and exalts them into virtues, ſo the ſtrong deluſion of ſuch a ſtate, only renders the paſſions more groſs and violent. And here it may be worth while to take notice, that his Lordſhip, in this objection to an extraordinary Providence, from the hurt it does to general *benevolence*, ſeems to have had the *Jewiſh People* in his eye; who in the latter ages of their republic, were commonly charged, and perhaps truly, with want of benevolence to the reſt of mankind: a fact, which tho' it makes nothing for his purpoſe, makes very much for mine, as it furniſhes me with an example to ſupport what is here ſaid of *Fanaticiſm*; an infirmity pretty general amongſt the Jews of thoſe Ages. They had outlived their extraordinary Providence, but not the memory, nor even the

Digitized by Google

the effects of it: Nay, the warmer tempers were hardly brought to think it had ceased. This filled them with spiritual pride, as the elect of God; a disposition which, it is confessed, tends naturally to destroy or to *relax* general benevolence.

Let us see now, on the other hand, the natural consequences, which the *actual* administration of an *equal* Providence would have on the human mind. In this case, as in the other, a warm temper, whose object was Religion, would be obnoxious to the common imbecillity of our nature, and too apt to disgrace itself by *spiritual pride:* but as this is one of the vices which an equal Providence is always at hand to punish, the cure would be direct and speedy. The recovered Votary we will now suppose to be received again into the number of the Good; and to find himself in the *little flock and chosen sheep*, as they are nick-named by this noble Writer. Well, but his danger is not yet over; the sense of this high prerogative of humanity, might revive in a warm temper, the still unmortified seeds of *spiritual pride*. Admit it might; and see

Digitized by Google

what follows. His *pride* revives indeed, but it is only to be again humbled: for puniſhment is ſtill cloſely attendant on vice and folly. At length, this holy diſcipline, the neceſſary conſequence of an equal Providence, effectually does its work, it purifies the mind from low and ſelfiſh partialities, and adorns the will with general benevolence, public ſpirit, and love of all its fellow Creatures.

What then could ſupport his Lordſhip in ſo perverſe a judgment concerning the ſtate and condition of good men under an *equal* Providence? That which ſupports all his other inſults on Religion; his ſophiſtical change of the queſtion. He objects to an *equal providence* (which Religioniſts pretend has been adminiſtered during one period of the Diſpenſation of Grace) where good men are conſtantly rewarded, and wicked-men as conſtantly puniſhed; and he takes the matter of his objection from the fanatical idea of a *favoured elect*, (which never exiſted but in overheated brains) where reward and puniſhment are diſtributed, not on the proportions of merit and demerit, but on the diabolic dreams of certain eternal decrees of election and reproba-

Digitized by Google

reprobation, unrelated to any human principle of juſtice.

But, now, Sir, keep the queſtion ſteddily in your eye, and his Lordſhip's reaſoning in this paragraph will diſcloſe ſuch a complication of abſurdities as will aſtoniſh you. You will ſee an equal Providence, which, in and thro' the very act of rewarding benevolence, public ſpirit, and humility, becomes inſtrumental in producing, in thoſe ſo rewarded, ſelfiſhneſs, neglect of the public, and ſpiritual pride.

His Lordſhip's laſt objection to an extraordinary Providence is, that it would NOT ANSWER ITS END.

" I will conclude this head (ſays he) " by obſerving, that we have *example* as " well as *reaſon* for us, when we reject " the hypotheſis of particular providences. " God was the king of the Jewiſh People. His preſence reſided amongſt " them, and his juſtice was manifeſted " daily in rewarding and puniſhing by " unequivocal, ſignal, and miraculous interpoſitions of his power. The effect " of all was this, the People rebelled at " one time and repented at another. Par-

Digitized by Google

" ticular providences, directed by God
" himſelf immediately, upon the ſpot, if
" I may ſay ſo, had particular temporal
" effects only, none general nor laſting;
" and the People were ſo little ſatisfied
" with this ſyſtem of Government, that
" they depoſed the ſupreme Being, and
" inſiſted to have another King, and to
" be governed like their neighbours [6]."

In ſupport of this laſt objection you ſee, his Lordſhip was forced to throw off the maſk, and fairly tell us what he aimed at; that is to ſay, to diſcredit the extraordinary Providence mentioned by Moſes. An *equal* Providence, ſays he, will not anſwer its *end*. What is its end? Here, his prevarications bring us, as uſual, to our diſtinctions.—When this Providence is adminiſtered for the ſake of *Particulars*, its firſt end is to diſcipline us in virtue, and keep us in our duty: When adminiſtered for the ſake of a *Community*, its firſt end is to ſupport the Inſtitution it had erected.

Now his Lordſhip, proceeding from *reaſon* to *example*, gives us this of the Jewiſh Republic, to prove that an equal or

[6] Vol. v. p. 430.

extra-

Digitized by Google

extraordinary Providence does not anſwer one or other or both theſe ends.

But it is unlucky for him, that in this very place, where he employs the *example*, he cannot forbear, any more than in numberleſs others of his writings, to tell us that he believes nothing of the matter.—*How long this Theocracy may be ſaid to have continued* (ſays he) *I am quite unconcerned to know, and ſhould be ſorry to miſpend my time in inquiring.*

The *example* then is only an argument *ad hominem*. But the misfortune is, that no Laws of Logic will admit an argument *ad hominem* on this queſtion, *Of the* EFFECTS *of a* REAL *extraordinary providence*; becauſe the nature of the effects of a REAL providence can never be diſcovered by the effects of a PRETENDED one. To ſay the truth, his Lordſhip is at preſent out of luck. For had he indeed believed the extraordinary providence of the Jews to be *real*, his own repreſentation of the caſe would, on his own principles, have proved it but *pretended*. For 'tis a principle with him, that where the *means* do not produce the *end*, ſuch means (all pretences notwithſtanding) are but human inventions.

Digitized by Google

It is thus he argues againſt the Divinity of the Chriſtian Religion; which he concludes to be an impoſture for its not having effected that laſting reformation of manners, which he ſuppoſes was its principal aim to accompliſh.

So far as to the CHOICE of his *example*. He manages no better in the APPLICATION of it.

We have diſtinguiſhed, concerning the *ends* of an extraordinary providence. Let us ſuppoſe now, that his Lordſhip takes the principal end of the Jewiſh Theocracy to be the reformation of *Particulars*. He refers to their hiſtory, and pretends to ſhew they were not reformed. Now whatever other conſequences may attend this ſuppoſed Fact, the moſt obvious and glaring is this, That his Lordſhip, in proceeding from *reaſon* to *example*, has given us ſuch an *example*, as overturns and wipes out his *reaſoning*. According to his *reaſoning*, an extraordinary providence would tye virtue and good manners ſo faſt down upon every Individual, that his very *Will* would be forced, and the *merit* of doing what he had it not in his power to forbear, abſolutely deſtroyed. You would now perhaps expect

Digitized by Google

expect his *example* ſhould confirm his fact? Juſt otherwiſe. His example ſhews, his fact to be a fiction, and that men remained as bad as ever.

But I have no need of taking any artificial advantage of his Lordſhip's bad reaſoning. For, when we ſee it ſo conſtantly oppoſed to *truth*, it is far from being an additional diſcredit to it, that it is as conſtantly oppoſed to *himſelf*.

The truth indeed is, that the great and principal end of the JEWISH THEOCRACY, was the keeping that People a ſeparate nation, under their own Law and Religion, till the coming of the MESSIAH; and to prepare for his reception by preſerving amongſt them the doctrine of the UNITY. Now, to judge whether the *Theocracy* or extraordinary Providence compaſſed its *end*, we have only to conſider, Whether this people, to the coming of Chriſt, did continue a diſtinct Nation ſeparated from all the other tribes of Mankind, and diſtinguiſhed from them by the worſhip of the true God only. And on inquiry, we ſhall find, they not only did continue thus diſtinct and diſtinguiſhed, but have ſo continued ever ſince. A ſingularity

Digitized by Google

gularity which has had no *example* amongſt any other People: And is ſufficient to convince us, that there muſt have been ſome amazing power in that *Theocracy*, which could go on operating for ſo many ages after the extraordinary adminiſtration of it had ceaſed. Let us conclude therefore, that the having nothing to urge againſt the *due efficacy* of this extraordinary providence, but that, *the people rebelled at one time and repented at another, and that this providence had only temporary effects*, is the moſt ample confeſſion of his defeat. And ſo much, for his Lordſhip's exploits in ANTIENT POLITICS.

Let us now come a little nearer to him, and conſider him in his talents for the MODERN.

Here his Lordſhip ſhines without a Rival.

" Whether to *ſettle peace* or to *unfold*
" The drift of hollow ſtates—beſides to know
" Both SPIRITUAL POWER AND CIVIL, what
" each means,
" What ſevers each,"——

as

Digitized by Google

as a Poet of the laſt age writes of *his* political Friend; who if he did not employ his talents more happily to himſelf or his Country, had much more to anſwer for, as they were vaſtly ſuperior to our turbulent Gentleman's.

However, with the beſt he has, he proceeds to overturn the PRINCIPLES of the ALLIANCE BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE. But the pains he had taken, and the oppoſition he had found from the ARGUMENT of the DIVINE LEGATION, had, by the time he came upon this ſecond Adventure, ſo ruffled his manners and diſcompoſed his temper, that he now breaks out in all kinds of opprobrious language not only againſt the Syſtem, but even againſt the perſon of the Author.

To underſtand the nature of his Lordſhip's provocation, if at leaſt it aroſe from this treatiſe of the *Alliance*, it may not be improper to ſay a word or two of the occaſion of that Book, and of the Principles on which it is compoſed.

After the many violent convulſions our Country had ſuffered ſince the *Reformation*, by the rage of religious Parties (in which, at one time, liberty of Conſcience was oppreſſed; and at another, the eſtabliſhed Church ruined and overthrown) it pleaſed divine Providence to ſettle our religious Rights on ſuch

Digitized by Google

principles of juſtice and equity, and to ſecure the civil peace on ſuch maxims of wiſdom and true policy, as moſt effectually guarded both againſt the return of their reſpective violations: and the means employed by this all wiſe providence was the giving, on proper terms of ſecurity to the national Religion, a free toleration to all who diſſented from the eſtabliſhed Worſhip. This ſeemed to be going as far towards perfection, in religious Communion, as the long diſtracted ſtate of the chriſtian Church would ſuffer us to indulge our hopes.

But men had not been long in poſſeſſion of this bleſſing before they grew weary of it, and ſet on foot many inventions, to throw us back into our old diſorders. For it is to be obſerved with ſorrow, that this reform of the Engliſh Conſtitution happened not to be the good work of the CHURCH, begun in the conviction of Truth, and carried on upon the principles of Charity: but was rather owing to the vigilance of the STATE, at one time, vainly perhaps, anxious for the eſtabliſhed Religion [a]; at another, wiſely provident for the ſupport of civil Liberty [b]. So that when ſucceeding diſſentions in Church and State had made this newly reformed Conſtitution the ſubject of enquiry,

[a] *Ch.* II. [b] *Will.* III.

the

Digitized by Google

the Parties who managed the debate, being thoſe who before, had both perſecuted and ſuffered in their turns, the principles and tempers they brought with them to the diſcuſſion of the right, were not ſuch perhaps as were beſt fitted either to regulate their judgments, or to moderate their deciſions. *One* Party ſeemed to regard the TOLERATION as an evil in itſelf, and only a temporary expedient to prevent worſe; while their conduct ſhewed they lay atwatch for the firſt occaſion to break in upon it. This was enough to miſlead the *Other* to conſider the TEST LAW, which covered and ſecured the eſtabliſhed Religion, as no better than a new ſpecies of perſecution: and having now no real injury to complain of, they began to take umbrage at this ſhadow of a grievance: to have divine Worſhip really free, they held, that no religious profeſſion ſhould be attended with civil incapacities: a TEST had made that diſtinction amongſt God's Worſhipers; it was therefore to be ſet aſide. But every man ſaw (and perhaps the enemies of the *Teſt* were not amongſt the laſt who ſaw it) that to ſet aſide *this Law*, which, under a general *Toleration* was the only ſecurity of the

Digitized by Google

eſtabliſhed Church, was expoſing the National worſhip, to all the inroads of a ſectarian rabble. This miſchievous project, ariſing out of abuſed liberty, was at firſt entertained, as we may well ſuppoſe, by the tolerated Churches only. Some of the more ingenuous of them adopted it out of fear, on the diſcovery of that bigotted principle in their Adverſaries, which conſidered *Toleration* as only a temporary expedient: And where was the wonder if thoſe who believed, they had no ſecurity for what they had got, while ſuch principles prevailed, ſhould endeavour to put it out of the power of their adverſaries to diſturb them? Others of a more politic turn cheriſhed it from views of ambition, and in hopes of ſharing the emoluments of the eſtabliſhed Church. It was ſome time before any Member of the Church of England joined with Diſſenters in their clamours againſt a *Teſt Law*, or, more properly ſpeaking, againſt their own *Eſtabliſhment*. This monſtrous coalition did not happen till a warm diſpute on certain metaphyſical queſtions, either too ſublime to become the ſubject of human wit, or too trifling to gain the attention of reaſonable men,

Digitized by Google

men, had ſtarted new ſcruples concerning Church Subſcription. And to get rid of this neceſſary engagement to *peace*, and acquieſcence in the eſtabliſhed Religion, theſe wiſe and faithful Miniſters of the National Worſhip were amongſt the foremoſt, to lend a hand to it's deſtruction, and the buſieſt to trample down all its fences and ſecurities.

BIGOTRY, you ſee, was at the bottom of the firſt ſet of principles; and *Fanaticiſm*, of the other. In their ſeparate appeals to the experience of Mankind, there was this remarkable difference; All ages had felt the miſchiefs of religious reſtraint and perſecution; but there was no example, either in Pagan or in Chriſtian times, of the evils attending the WANT *of an eſtabliſhed Religion*. The *Fanatics* therefore, were perpetually urging their experience againſt perſecution, ſecure in not having the argument retorted upon them. But, in this imaginary advantage they deceived themſelves; and the very *want* of examples was the greateſt Advantage the *Bigots* had over them. It is true, (theſe might reply,) we have no inſtance of the evils attending the *want* of an eſtabliſhed

Digitized by Google

Religion. But the reaſon is, becauſe no nation was ever without one: The neceſſity of it, for the ſupport of Society, being ſo indiſpenſable, that Men even in the wildeſt times, who hated religious Eſtabliſhments moſt, and who had been ſworn and *leagued* together for their deſtruction, had no ſooner the power to effect it, by the ſuperiority of their arms, than they found, in ſettling the State, a neceſſity of ſupporting an eſtabliſhed Church. Of which, we have a remarkable example in the INDEPENDENT *Republic*, and the *Protectorſhip* of OLIVER; both of whom, under their ſeveral Uſurpations, were forced to erect PRESBYTERY, the Religion they moſt hated, into the NATIONAL CHURCH.

To proceed, the diſtempers of the State, ſtill further contributed to inflame thoſe of the Church; and, on the Acceſſion of the preſent Line to the Throne, occaſioned a long, a famous, and a regular diſpute concerning the powers, bounds, and limits of the *two Societies*. But as the ſeveral diſputants had reciprocally given too much and too little both to Church and State; and had bottomed their reaſon-

Digitized by Google

reaſonings on one common fallacy; the defenders of a TEST, ſupported it on ſuch reaſoning as deſtroyed a Toleration; and the Defenders of religious Liberty, argued againſt the juſtice and equity of that ſecurity, on ſuch principles as concluded equally againſt a national Church.

In this embroiled condition, the Author of the *Alliance between Church and State* found the ſentiments of men concerning religious Liberty and eſtabliſhments, when he propoſed his *Theory* to their conſideration: a Theory calculated to vindicate our preſent happy Conſtitution ON A PRINCIPLE OF RIGHT, By adjuſting the preciſe bounds of the two Societies; by ſhewing how they come to act in conjunction; and by explaining the nature of their Union: and from thence, by natural and neceſſary conſequence, inducing, on the one hand, an ESTABLISHED RELIGION, with all its rights and privileges, ſecured by a TEST LAW; and on the other, a full and free TOLERATION to all who diſſented from the National Worſhip.

He firſt ſhewed the uſe of Religion to Society, from the experience and practice of all Ages: He inquired from whence the

Digitized by Google

uſe ariſes, and found it to be from certain eſſential defects in the very nature and plan of Civil Society. He went on to the Nature of Religion; and ſhewed how, and for what cauſes, it conſtituted a Society: And then, from the Natures of the *two Societies*, he collected, that the object of the Civil, is only the *body* and its intereſts; and the object of the Religious, only the *Soul*. Hence he concluded, that they are both ſovereign, and independent; becauſe they ariſe not out of one another; and becauſe, as they are concerned in contrary provinces, they can never meet to claſh: the ſame-neſs of *original*, or *adminiſtration*, being the only cauſes which can bring one, of two different Societies, into natural ſubjection to the other.

To apply Religion therefore, to the ſervice of Civil Society in the beſt manner it is capable of being applied, he ſhewed it was neceſſary that the *two Societies* ſhould be *united:* For each being ſovereign and independent, there was no other way of applying that Aſſiſtance, in any ſolid or effectual manner. But no ſuch union could ariſe but from *free compact* and convention.

Digitized by Google

And free convention is never likely to happen, unleſs each Society has its mutual motives, and mutual advantages. The Author therefore, from what he had laid down of the natures of the *two Societies*, explained what thoſe motives and advantages were. The reſult of which was, that all the rights, privileges, and prerogatives of the *two Societies*, thus united, with the Civil Magiſtrate at their head, appeared to be thoſe very rights, privileges, and prerogatives, which we find eſtabliſhed and enjoyed under our preſent happy Conſtitution in Church and State; which hath perfectly reconciled an ESTABLISHED CHURCH with a free TOLERATION, by the medium of a TEST LAW: This Law therefore the Author in the laſt place, proceeded to vindicate, on the ſame general principles of the Law of nature and nations.

You have here, Sir, a true, tho' ſhort, Analyſis of the *Alliance between Church and State*; with the principles on which the Theory is conducted.

Let us now examine the account his Lordſhip has been pleaſed to give of it. I ſhall take him paragraph by paragraph, in

Digitized by Google

his native diſorder, as he lies: And for the ſame reaſon, that I followed a different method in confuting his Arguments againſt the *moral attributes*, which I thought fit to methodize and digeſt. For when a diſorderly writer is tolerably clear, you may make him ſtill clearer, and ſhew his arguments to more advantage, by reducing them into form. But when he is above meaſure cloudy and confuſed, as here in reaſoning againſt the book of the *Alliance*, the like Aſſiſtance would be ſuſpicious: for the cloud being immoveable, the Reader might come to fancy that both the *obſcurity*, and the *order* were of the anſwerer's making. Therefore the ſafeſt, as well as faireſt way, in this caſe, is to tranſcribe the Writer as he lies, and anſwer him as he riſes. The obſcurities in thought and expreſſion, will be then found his own; and nothing can be objected to his adverſary, but a few repetitions, which in this method of anſwering could not be avoided.

His Lordſhip preludes his attack upon the Book, and the Author, with this curious Narrative.

" I have heard of a Sermon preached " by one Doctor SENIOR, a Fellow of " Trinity

Digitized by Google

" Trinity College, in Cambridge, before " King Charles the Second at New-mar- " ket, *in the days of paſſive obedience and* " *non-reſiſtance*, and afterwards printed. " His text was taken from the 14, 15, " and 16 verſes of the ivth Ch. of Exodus, " or ſome of them; wherein God directs " MOSES to take AARON the Levite, be- " cauſe he knew that AARON could ſpeak " well to the People, and joins them to- " gether in Commiſſion, that they might " aſſiſt one another mutually; that AA- " RON might be inſtead of a mouth to " MOSES, and that MOSES might be in- " ſtead of God to AARON. What other " applications the good Doctor made of " theſe texts, I know not. But I am in- " formed by Mr. LEWIS, who has read " the Sermon, that he eſtabliſhed on " them a ſuppoſed *Alliance between the* " *Church and the State:* or rather between " the Church and the King. By this *Al-* " *liance* the well-ſpoken Levite was to in- " ſtil paſſive obedience to the King, in " the minds of the People, and to inſiſt " on it, as on a Law of God: The King, " on the other hand, was to be the nur- " ſing Father of the Church, to ſupport

Digitized by Google

" her Authority, to preſerve, at leaſt, if
" not increaſe, her immunities, and to
" keep her in the full poſſeſſion of all the
" advantages ſhe claimed. The Church
" performed her part, and had a right, by
" virtue of this alliance, if the King did
" not perform his, to teach this doctrine
" no longer, and to reſume her independency
" on the State and on him. This was the
" purport of the ſermon, at leaſt: and WAR-
" BURTON took his hint, POSSIBLY, from
" it, and turned it to ſerve his purpoſe; that
" is, to lay down the ſame principles and
" TO BANTER MANKIND IF HE COULD,
" by NOT drawing directly, and avowedly,
" from them the ſame concluſion. Dr.
" SENIOR's authority is, no doubt, as
" good in this caſe, as that of DE MARCA
" or even of BOSSUET. The firſt, a time-
" ſerving Prieſt, intereſted, and a great
" flatterer, if ever there was one, and
" who made no ſcruple to explain away
" whatſoever he had found himſelf obliged
" to ſay in favour of the State. The latter
" was as wiſe, if not as cunning, as learn-
" ed, and a much better man, tho' not ſo
" much in the favour of Mr. WARBUR-
" TON, who gave them Characters in his

" aſſuming

Digitized by Google

" assuming style, without knowing any " thing of them; and who has the *impertinence to pronounce* of the greatest Scholar, the greatest Divine, and the greatest Orator of his age, that *he was a good sensible Man.* He was all I have " said of him: but he was an Ecclesiastic, " and a subject of France [1]."

As to his Lordship's account of this Dr. SENIOR, I scarce know what credit it deserves: For he who will falsify a Book in every body's hands, will hardly be very scrupulous of what he says about a Sermon, which nobody has heard of, but his Friend Mr. LEWIS. At least if Doctor SENIOR was ever a man existing in this world, I should fancy he must be later than where his Lordship, who is no great Chronologer, has thought fit to place him. He tells us it was *in the days of passive obedience and non-resistance*, and that the doctrine of his sermon was calculated for the service of popery and arbitrary power. May we not suppose then, that he flourished under his Lordship's *Auspices*, when the Church was last in danger? If this were the case, his Lordship uses Dr. SENIOR just as he used St.

[1] Vol. iv. p. 515.

PAUL,

Digitized by Google

PAUL [2], firſt ſets him upon preaching *paſſive Obedience*, and then abuſes him for his pains.

But let Dr. SENIOR live when and where he would, his Lordſhip thinks 'tis POSSIBLE that WARBURTON *might have taken the hint of the Alliance from him.* Yes, juſt as *poſſible* as that LOCKE took the hint of the *original compact* from FILMAR.

He aſſures us, however, that *the Authority of Dr.* SENIOR *is as good as that of* DE MARCA, *or even of* BOSSUET. The authority of Dr. SENIOR! For what?—To ſupport Mr. WARBURTON's *doctrine of the Alliance.* But where is it to be had! Of Lord BOLINGBROKE, or Mr. LEWIS? Suppoſe this difficulty to be got over; and Dr. SENIOR as ready at hand as DE MARCA or BOSSUET; yet the Author of the *Alliance*, perhaps, would not think it altogether ſo fit for his purpoſe: For he tells us, that his purpoſe in ſo frequently quoting the acknowledgments of DE MARCA and BOSSUET, in

[2] "By this *Alliance* of the hierarchy and the "Monarchy, Religion that ſhould ſupport good go- "vernment alone, was employed to ſupport good "and bad government alike, AS IT HAS BEEN BY ST. "PAUL." Vol. iv. p. 516.

favour

Digitized by Google

favour of the State againſt the incroachments of the Church, was to ſhame thoſe *Proteſtant* Divines who had contended for the *independency* of the Church, when eſtabliſhed; and even for its *ſuperiority* before.

But, of theſe two famous Frenchmen, *The firſt* (he ſays) *was a time-ſerving Prieſt, intereſted, and a great flatterer—the latter was as wiſe if not as cunning, as learned and a much better Man, tho' not ſo much in the favour of Mr. Warburton, who gave them Characters, in his aſſuming ſtyle, without knowing any thing of them, and who has the impertinence to pronounce, of the greateſt Scholar, the greateſt Divine, and the greateſt Orator of his age, that* HE WAS A GOOD SENSIBLE MAN.

The Author of the *Alliance*, in the *Advertiſement* to the laſt Edition of his Book, ſpeaking of the French Tranſlator, has theſe words— "He ſupported them "[the concluſions] all along with quota- "tions from the two famous works of "DE MARCA and BOSSUET; the one the "wiſeſt, and the other the MOST SENSIBLE "DIVINE THAT NATION EVER PRODU- "CED [3]."

[3] P. 13.

From

Digitized by Google

From theſe words, I leave you, Sir, to reflect upon the truth and ingenuity of the noble Writer's repreſentation, that BOSSUET is *not ſo much in Mr. Warburton's favour* as DE MARCA; and that Mr. Warburton has *the impertinence to pronounce* that BOSSUET was A GOOD SENSIBLE MAN. In the heavy diſtreſſes of Controverſy, many a Writer has been found to miſrepreſent. But to do this out of mere wantonneſs and gayety of heart, and then, on the credit of his miſquotations, to abuſe and call names, is altogether in his Lordſhip's manner.

But you will ſay, perhaps, that the IMPERTINENCE was not in the *familiarity* of the commendation, but in the *choice* of the topic. It may be ſo; and then we get another Rule of good writing from his Lordſhip, who has already furniſhed us with ſo many: "That when the *authority* of an Author is urged in a point concerning Civil and Religious Rights, his *learning*, his *divinity*, and, above all, his *eloquence* ſhould be inſiſted on, rather than his GOOD SENSE."

All this is but a prelude to the Combat. "The notion (ſays this great "Politician) of a FORMAL ALLIANCE "between

Digitized by Google

" between Church and State, as between " two independent, distinct powers, is a " very groundless and WHIMSICAL no- " tion. But a fraudulent or silent com- " pact between princes and priests became " very real, as soon as an ecclesiastical " order was established [4]." The latter part of this period is but too true; and the Theory of the *Alliance*, (misrepresented in the former part,) was proposed to remedy these mischiefs. It is this Theory only, which I shall undertake to vindicate against his Lordship's Objections.

If, by *formal*, he means (and what should he mean else) one actually executed in form; and supposes that the Author of the *Alliance between Church and State*, asserted the actual execution of such a one, we may, with more justice perhaps, apply to his Lordship what he says of the Author, concerning DE MARCA and BOSSUET, *That he gives a Character of the book called the Alliance, without knowing any thing of it.* Give me leave to quote the Author's own words — " From all this " it appears, that our plan of Alliance is " no precarious arbitrary Hypothesis, but

[4] Vol. iv. p. 515—16.

" a The-

" a Theory founded in reaſon, and the
" invariable nature of things. For having
" from the eſſence collected the *neceſſity*
" of allying, and the *freedom* of the com-
" pact; we have from the ſame *neceſſity*,
" fairly introduced it; and from its *free-*
" *dom*, conſequentially eſtabliſhed every
" mutual term and condition of it. So
" that now if the reader ſhould aſk, where
" this Charter or treaty of convention for
" the union of the two Societies, on the
" terms here delivered, is to be met with?
" we are enabled to anſwer him. We
" ſay, it may be found in the ſame Ar-
" chive with the famous ORIGINAL COM-
" PACT between Magiſtrate and People;
" ſo much inſiſted on, in vindication of
" the common rights of Subjects. Now
" when a ſight of this *compact* is required
" of the Defenders of Civil liberty, they
" hold it ſufficient to ſay, that it is enough
" for all the purpoſes of fact and right,
" that ſuch original compact is the only
" legitimate foundation of Civil Society:
" That if there were NO SUCH THING
" FORMALLY executed, there was, *vir-*
" *tually*: That all differences between
" Magiſtrate and People ought to be re-

Digitized by Google

" gulated on the ſuppoſition of ſuch a " Compact; and all Government reduced " to the principles therein laid down; " for that the happineſs of which Civil " Society is productive, can only be at- " tained by it, when formed on thoſe " principles. Now ſomething like this " we ſay of our *Alliance between Church* " *and State* [5]."

Let this ſerve too, for an anſwer to his Lordſhip's inſulting queſtion in another place — " But where ſhall we look for the " conditions of that *original contract which* " *was made between the religious and the ci-* " *vil Society*, I know not; unleſs we ſup- " poſe them written on the back of Con- " ſtantine's grant to Sylveſter [6]." Does his Lordſhip know where to look for the *original contract which was made between the prince and people*, in any place of eaſier acceſs? Or will he, when at a loſs, ſend us to the *back of Conſtantine's grant to Sylveſter*, for this contract likewiſe? But to proceed. If by *formally*, through a perverſe uſe of words, his Lordſhip means only *virtually*, like the *original compact* be-

[5] Alliance, third Edition, p. 165—6—7.
[6] Vol. iv. p. 419.

tween

tween King and People, This indeed, the Author of the *Alliance* does venture to ſay; and not only to ſay, but to prove likewiſe.

It is true, the foundation of the proof, in his Lordſhip's opinion, ſtands upon a WHIMSICAL principle: ſo did the argument of the Divine Legation of Moſes, from the Omiſſion of a future State. Indeed his Lordſhip ſeems to have been as much diſtreſſed by WHIMSICAL *Divines*, when he wrote his *eſſays*, as he was by WHIMSICAL *Politicians*, when he wrote his Letter to Sir *W. Windham*. However, the *whimſical* principle, in queſtion is this, That THE CHURCH OF CHRIST COMPOSES A SOCIETY SOVEREIGN, AND INDEPENDENT OF THE CIVIL.

This principle, his Lordſhip denies. And it muſt be confeſſed, not, as is his wont, altogether abſurdly: For he who makes Religion itſelf a Fantom, can have but a ſlender idea how it ſhould become embodied.

" Neither NATURE nor REASON (ſays " his Lordſhip) could ever lead men to " imagine TWO DISTINCT AND INDE- " PENDENT SOCIETIES IN THE SAME " SOCIETY.

Digitized by Google

" SOCIETY. This imagination was broach-
" ed by eccleſiaſtical ambition [7]."

A grave ſentence, which to me ſeems equivalent to this, That *neither nature nor reaſon could ever lead men to imagine that* ONE *was* TWO. In this, I readily agree with his Lordſhip. But then the difficulty remains, how ſuch a thing could ever come to be *broached*, (as his Lordſhip ſays it was) by any *imagination* not more diſordered, than it uſually is, by *Eccleſiaſtical Ambition*. School-Learning, indeed, might do much; for there, his Lordſhip has fixed his theological-Bedlam: But *Church Ambition*, he aſſures us, is of another mold; which, as it never failed to *aim at*, ſo, he aſſures us, it never failed to *obtain*, *immoderate Wealth and exorbitant Power*. What then are we to think? That his Lordſhip meant, that *neither Nature nor Reaſon could ever lead men to imagine two diſtinct and independent Societies in the ſame* COMMUNITY? for *Community* being the genus, ſeveral Societies, as the ſpecies, may, indeed, be contained in it. This, merely for my own eaſe, I am ready to ſuppoſe, be-

[7] Vol. iv. p. 412.

cauſe when his Lordſhip is well underſtood, he is always more than half confuted.

In this paragraph then are contained theſe two propoſitions:

1. That the Church does not compoſe a *Society*.

2. That it does not compoſe a Society *independent and ſovereign*.

Let us examine his reaſoning on theſe points as it lies in his works; for as diſorderly as it lies, it is meant, I will aſſure you, to overturn the whole Theory of the *Alliance*.

"A RELIGIOUS SOCIETY (ſays his "Lordſhip) BY WHICH IS MEANT, ON "THIS OCCASION, A CLERGY, is, or is "not, a creature of the State. *If the firſt*, "it follows, that this order no more than "others, which the State has inſtituted for "the maintenance of good government, "can aſſume any rights, or exerciſe any "powers, except ſuch as the State has "thought fit to attribute to it, and that "the State may, and ought to keep a "conſtant controul over it, not only to pre-"vent uſurpations and abuſes, but to di-"rect the public and private influence of "the Clergy, in a ſtrict conformity to the "letter and ſpirit of the Conſtitution; the "ſervants

Digitized by Google

" ſervants of which, in a much truer " ſenſe, they are, than what they affect " ſometimes to call themſelves, the Am- " baſſadors of God to other men. *If the* " *laſt* is ſaid, if it be aſſerted, that the " Church is in any ſort independent on the " State, there ariſes from this pretenſion " the greateſt abſurdity imaginable, that, " I mean, of Imperium in Imperio; an " Empire of divine, in an Empire of hu- " man inſtitution [8]."

Thus far his Lordſhip, who is here reaſoning againſt the principles laid down in the book of the *Alliance*. He introduces his Argument with telling the Reader, that the Author of that Book has defined a *religious Society*, to be the *body of the Clergy*. —*A religious Society, by which* (ſays he) IS MEANT ON THIS OCCASION A CLERGY, *is, or is not, a Creature of the State* [9].

You cannot, I believe, ſee this aſſertion without ſome ſurprize, when you obſerve, that the Author of the *Alliance* has defined a *religious Society* to be A NUMBER OF RE-

[8] Vol. iv. p. 413.

[9] So again, *This order of men which we* CALL *the Religious ſociety*,—V. iv. p. 440. And again,—*The Religious Society, as we have accuſtomed our ſelves to* CALL *the Clergy*. V. iv. p. 561.

Digitized by Google

LIGIOUS CREATURES ASSOCIATED [9]. — When you obſerve, that He makes it one of the principal cares of a *religious Society*, to provide an *order of men*, to be ſet apart for miniſtring in holy things, or in other words, a CLERGY. — "The "greateſt care is to be had, that the acts "of religious worſhip be preſerved ſimple, "decent, and ſignificative. But this can "be done only by providing perſons ſet "apart for this office; whoſe peculiar "employment it ſhall be to preſide in, di- "rect, and ſuperintend the Acts and Ser- "vices of Religion, *&c.* [10]" — When you obſerve, he makes the *end* of religious Society to be, *ſalvation of Souls*, and one of the *means*, the *order* of the *Clergy*. —Laſtly when you obſerve, he oppoſes the *Church* and the *Clergy* to each other. It "is unjuſt in the CHURCH to aim at the "Propagation of Religion by force, and "impertinent to aim at riches, honours, "and powers. But what motives the "CLERGY OF A CHURCH might have, "is nothing to the purpoſe of our in- "quiry. We have only to conſider "what the CHURCH had, WHICH, as "a religious Society, conſiſts of the whole

[9] *Alliance*, p. 55. [10] *Alliance*, p. 61.

"body

Digitized by Google

" body of the Community, BOTH LAITY " AND CLERGY [1]."

In a word, the Author of the *Alliance*, was at much pains to prove that a *religious Society* or *Church*, does *not mean* the *Clergy*, but the whole body of the faithful: and this for two reaſons, for the ſake of truth in general, and of his own ſyſtem in particular.

1. It ſhocks common Senſe to call one order or rank in Society, by the name of the Society: it is little better than calling one of the qualities of a Subſtance, by the name of the Subſtance.

2. It ſubverted the Theory of the *Alliance* to make the *Clergy*, the *Church*: for then the Church could neither be a diſtinct Society, nor independent; both of which it muſt be, to make it capable of an *Alliance* with the State. It could not be a diſtinct Society; for an *order* of men, as I obſerved juſt be-

[1] *Alliance*, p. 112. The very popiſh Clergy, nay even that *time-ſerving prieſt*, *and great Flatterer*, DE MARCA, were more honeſt than his Lordſhip repreſents the Engliſh Clergy, as he might have ſeen by the quotation at the bottom of this very page of the *Alliance* — ECCLESIÆ CORPUS, EX FIDELIUM OMNIUM COMPAGE CONSTITUITUR.

Digitized by Google

fore, is the ſame in politics, as a quality in phyſics; the one muſt inhere in a *Society*, the other in a *Subſtance:* and theſe being the ſubſtrata of the other, to talk of the independent exiſtence of an *order*, or of a *quality*, is the profoundeſt nonſenſe in Politics and Phyſics. But admitting, that ſuch a Church, which like *Trinculo's* kingdom, conſiſts only of *Viceroys, and Viceroys over them*, was capable of allying with the State, the Author has ſhewn, in the place quoted above, that its motives for *Alliance* would be ſuch as the State could not comply with, either in juſtice or policy.

But extreme neceſſity forced his Lordſhip upon this bold and violent falſification of the doctrine of the *Alliance*. He ſaw no other way of ſuppreſſing the opinion of an *independent religious Society*, than by ſhewing it to be an *Imperium in Imperio, an Empire of divine, in an Empire of human Inſtitution*; a miſchief, againſt which the State is always on its guard. And if a religious Society ſignified the Church, and the Church, only the *Clergy*, the claim to independency would imply ſuch an *Imperium*. But the Author of the *Alliance* goes upon another principle; he holds that the

Digitized by Google

Church ſignifies the whole body of the faithful; that though this Society be independent, yet, from this independency, no ſuch ſoleciſm in Politics can ariſe as an *Imperium in Imperio.* This argument, which the Author has drawn out at large, the noble perſon miſrepreſents, perverts, and attempts to overthrow.

" An Imperium in Imperio (ſays his " Lordſhip) is in truth ſo expreſly con- " tained in the very terms of the aſſertion, " that none of THE TEDIOUS SOPHISTI- " CAL REASONINGS, which have been em- " ployed for the purpoſe, can evade or " diſguiſe it. One of theſe I will mention, " becauſe it has a CERTAIN AIR OF PLAU- " SIBILITY, that impoſes on many; and " becauſe, if it cannot ſtand a ſhort and fair " examination, as I think it cannot, the " whole edifice of eccleſiaſtical *independency* " *and grandeur*, falls to the ground. It has " been ſaid then, that religious and civil " ſocieties are widely diſtinguiſhed by the " diſtinct ends of their inſtitutions, which " imply neceſſarily diſtinct powers and " a mutual independency; that the end of " the one, is the Salvation of Souls, and

Digitized by Google

" that of the other the ſecurity of tempo-
" ral intereſts; that the ſtate puniſhes
" overt acts, and can puniſh nothing elſe,
" becauſe it can have cognizance of no-
" thing that paſſes in the mind, and does
" not break out into criminal actions; but
" that the Church employing her influ-
" ence to temper the paſſions, to regulate
" the inward diſpoſitions, and to prevent
" ſins, as well as crimes, is that tribunal
" at which even intentions are to be tried,
" and ſins, that do not ripen into crimes,
" nor immediately affect civil Society, are
" to be puniſhed [2]."

This, I will ſuppoſe, his Lordſhip intended as a fair repreſentation of the Author's argument for the *independency* of the Church. Now the Argument, as it ſtands in the *Alliance*, is drawn from the different *powers*, belonging to the two Societies, as thoſe *powers* are deduced from their different *ends*. But different powers implying different adminiſtrations, create mutual independency; and different adminiſtrations implying an incapacity of their claſhing with one another, ſhew plainly that ſuch an independency can never produce an *Im-*

[2] Vol. iv. p. 413—14.

perium

Digitized by Google

perium in Imperio. This is the natural order of the argument. Let us ſee how his Lordſhip repreſents it. He begins rightly, with the different ends, *viz. Salvation of Souls*, and *Security of temporal intereſts:* But proceeding to ſpeak of the different *powers*, adapted to thoſe different *ends, viz. coercion* in the ſtate, and *perſuaſion* only in the Church (from whence ariſes a mutual independency) he miſtakes the *conſequences* of theſe powers, which are *puniſhment of overt acts*, and *ſubdual of the paſſions*, for the *powers themſelves*; from which conſequences indeed no independency enſues; becauſe *ſubdual of the paſſions* may, in his Lordſhip's opinion at leaſt, be atchieved by coercive power, as well as *puniſhment of overt acts.* And if both Societies have *coercive power*, one muſt needs be dependent on the other. I take notice of this miſtake only to ſhew you, what an imperfect and obſcure conception, his Lordſhip had of the Argument of the *Alliance.* Had he told us, tho' in fewer words, that the Author's reaſoning againſt the pretended *Imperium in Imperio*, ariſing out of a mutual independency, was this, That the State having coercive power, and the Church having

Digitized by Google

having none, the adminiſtration of the two Societies could never claſh; that oppoſition being the only circumſtance which makes the miſchief of an *Imperium in Imperio*; Had he told us this, I ſay, we ſhould have ſeen, that at leaſt he *underſtood* his Adverſary.

But let us conſider how he goes about to anſwer what he ſo ill repreſents.

" Now in anſwer to all this (ſays his " Lordſhip) WE MAY DENY, with truth " and reaſon on our ſide, that the avowed " ends of religious, and the real ends of " civil Society, are ſo diſtinct as to require " diſtinct powers, and a mutual indepen- " dency. The Salvation of Souls is not " the immediate end of civil Society, and " I wiſh it was not rather the pretence, " than the end of eccleſiaſtical policy; " but if to abſtain from evil and to do " good works, be means of ſalvation, " the means of ſalvation are the objects " of civil Government. It is the duty of " Princes and Magiſtrates to promote a " ſtrict obſervation of the Law of Nature, " of private and public morality, and to " make thoſe who live in ſubjection to " them, good men, in order to make them " good citizens. For this purpoſe, the

" ballance

Digitized by Google

"ballance and the ſword are put into their "hands, that they may meaſure out pu-"niſhment to every one, who injures the "Community, or does wrong to his neigh-"bour; and a rigorous puniſhment of "crimes, eſpecially if it be accompanied "with rewards and encouragements to vir-"tue, *for both are intruſted to the ſame* "*men* [3], is the ſureſt way not only to "reform the outward behaviour, but to "create an habitual inward diſpoſition to "the practice of Virtue [4]."

We may, ſays his Lordſhip, *deny that the avowed ends of religious, and the real ends of civil Society, are ſo diſtinct.*—Here he contradicts his maſter LOCKE. This indeed is a ſmall matter. I ſhall ſhew he contradicts Truth, and the whole ſyſtem of human affairs.—But before we come to that, there is a great deal to be done.—*We may*

[3] This is ſaid, I ſuppoſe, in confutation of what is aſſerted in the Book of the *Alliance*, (to ſhew the imperfection of the plan of civil power) that *reward* is not (as it is generally underſtood to be) one of the Sanctions of civil government, in the ſenſe that *Puniſhment* is ſo. But as this is all his Lordſhip has to ſay againſt it, I ſhall here let the matter reſt between them.

[4] Vol. iv. p. 414.

ſays

Digitized by Google

ſays his Lordſhip, *deny that the* AVOWED *ends of religious, and the* REAL *ends of civil Society, are ſo diſtinct, as to require diſtinct powers and a mutual dependency.* The *avowed ends*, does he ſay? *Avowed* by whom? Common ſenſe requires he ſhould mean, *avowed* by thoſe who go upon the principles of the book of *Alliance*. But then he *might* have ſaid *real*; for the *avowed* and the *real* ends coincide: He *ſhould* have ſaid *real*; for the fairneſs of the propoſition, and the force of the argument drawn from it, both require the uſe of this word. But by what he predicates of theſe *avowed ends*, *viz.* their *not requiring diſtinct powers*, we ſee, he means *avowed* by corrupt Churchmen. *The ſalvation of ſouls* (ſays he, immediately after) *is rather the pretence than the end of eccleſiaſtical policy:* and theſe *ends* are Church Uniformity for the ſake of ſpiritual dominion. Now theſe *avowed ends*, we readily confeſs, cannot be obtained without *coercive power* of the civil kind. Here then you have his Lordſhip, after all his declamation againſt ſpiritual tyranny, coming at laſt, in the true ſpirit of a free thinking politician, to profeſs that religious perſecution and coercive power are, in the order of things, as juſtly

Digitized by Google

juſtly and reaſonably employed in matters of conſcience, as in the overt acts of civil life: now tho' this be altogether upon principle, (for what ſhould reſtrain a Stateſman who believes nothing of the *truth of religion*, and ſees all the miſchiefs of *diverſity of opinions*, from attempting to bring about an outward uniformity, by force?) yet you would not have *expected* it in this place, where his Lordſhip is defending religious Liberty, againſt the wicked Author of the *Alliance*; nor would you have *found* it, had not the diſtreſſes of controverſy driven him into his native quarters, before his time. The *Alliance* went on this principle, that the Church was a ſociety, independent of the civil, as not having coercive power like the civil. To overturn this argument, his Lordſhip was forced to deny the minor, and ſo unawares has brought in *perſecution* as one of the natural powers of the Church. But to compaſs this matter neatly, and without noiſe, he has recourſe to his old trade, the employing, under an ambiguous expreſſion, the *abuſe* of the thing for the *thing itſelf*.—*The avowed ends of religious—the real ends of civil ſociety*.—But it was ſo glaring a truth, that the *ſalvation of ſouls* was the *real*

Digitized by Google

real end of religious, and *the ſecurity of temporal intereſts, the only end* of civil Society, that he muſt have loſt his ſenſes who could be brought to believe, that *coercive power* was as proper to promote the firſt as the ſecond; or that *inſtruction and exhortation*, was as proper to promote the ſecond as the firſt: one of which things, his aſſertion, *that the Church and State have not diſtinct powers*, neceſſarily implies: To diſguiſe this abſurdity therefore, for *real*, which fair argument required, he ſubſtitutes the ambiguous word, *avowed*, which his bad cauſe required. And under cover of this, he denies, that the two ſocieties are SO DISTINCT *as to require diſtinct powers*.—Well, this however we underſtand; and have thoroughly canvaſſed. But what mean the words that follow? — *And a mutual independency*. The author of the *Alliance* indeed had ſaid, that the ends of the two ſocieties were ſo diſtinct as to require *diſtinct powers*. But he was not ſo abſurd to add—*and a mutual independency*; becauſe, *independency* was not the *means* of attaining an end, like *diſtinct powers*, but a *conſequence* of thoſe powers: for if the powers, by which two ſocieties are adminiſtered,

Digitized by Google

niſtered, be *different*, thoſe ſocieties, (ſeeing their adminiſtrations can never claſh,) muſt needs be *independent* on one another. This is given only as another inſtance of the cloudy conception this great Politician had of the plain argument of the *Alliance*; and the firſt principles of Laws and Politics.

Let me now proceed with his reaſoning. He is to prove, what he had aſſerted, that the two ſocieties *are not ſo diſtinct as to require diſtinct powers.* He is writing againſt the book of the *Alliance*; the author of which lays it down as a principle, that the end of the *religious* is *ſalvation of Souls*; the end of the *Civil, ſecurity of temporal intereſts.* To this his Lordſhip replies, that ſalvation of ſouls is only the *pretended* end of the Religious; but the *real*, tho' not *immediate* end, of the Civil. And thus he has, with great dexterity, deſtroyed all diſtinction between the two Societies.

I have already detected both the fraud and fallacy of the firſt part of his aſſertion; I come now to the other, that *ſalvation of ſouls is the real, tho' not immediate, end of civil Government.* Here the meanneſs of his ſophiſtry is ſtill more apparent, than in the

Digitized by Google

the foregoing inſtance. It ſtands thus,—
" The *immediate* end of civil government is confeſſed, on all hands to be *ſecurity of temporal intereſts.* — This is done by keeping men *to abſtain from evil,* and exciting them to *good works* —*Good works are the means of ſalvation*—Therefore the *means of ſalvation are the objects of civil government*; or, in other words, the ſalvation of ſouls is at leaſt the *mediate* end of civil Society."

The Author of the *Alliance* had obviated all this poor ſophiſtry in the following words: " Civil Government, I ſuppoſe, " will be allowed to have been invented " for the attainment of ſome certain end or " ends excluſive of others: and this implies " the neceſſity of diſtinguiſhing this end " from others. Which diſtinction ariſes " from the different properties of the " things pretending. But amongſt all " thoſe things which are apt to obtrude, or " have in fact obtruded, upon men as the " ends of civil Government, there is but " one difference in their properties, as " ends: which is this, *that one of theſe is* " *attainable by civil Society only, and all* " *the reſt are eaſily attained without it.*

Digitized by Google

The thing then with the firſt mentioned property muſt needs be that *genuine end* of civil Society. And this is no other than *ſecurity to the temporal liberty and property of man* [5].

But his Lordſhip's ſophiſtry conſiſts in the ambiguity of the word END, which either ſignifies the conſequence or iſſue of a *mean*, ſimply; or, the conſequence and iſſue, with intention and fore-thought. In the firſt ſenſe it may be true, that ſalvation is the mediate end of civil Society; but then it is nothing to the purpoſe. In the ſecond ſenſe it is to the purpoſe, but not true. The civil Magiſtrate, all men ſee, had not this conſequence or iſſue in his thoughts; as is evident from hence, that, in adapting his puniſhments to unlawful actions, he does not proportion them to the heinouſneſs of the offence, as eſtimated on the principles of *natural* or of *revealed* Religion, but on their malignity to civil Society. A plain proof, that, when he meaſured out puniſhments to offences, he had only *political* and not *religious* conſiderations in his view. But you ſhall hear what the Author of the

[5] *Alliance*, p. 32—3.

Digitized by Google

Alliance has ſaid on this ſubject, who had confuted his Lordſhip's ſophiſm before he had conceived it.

" We have ſhewn (ſays this writer) " that it was the care of the *Bodies*, not of " the *Souls* of men, that the Magiſtrate un- " dertook to give account of. Whatever " therefore refers to the *body*, is in his ju- " riſdiction; whatever to the ſoul, is not. " But, and if there be that which refers " equally to both (as *Morals* plainly do) " ſuch thing muſt needs be partly within, " and partly without his province; that " is, it is to be *partially* conſidered by " him; his care thereto extending ſo far " only as it affects Society. The other " conſideration of it, namely as it makes " part of Religion, being in the Hands " of thoſe, who preſide in another kind " of Society. Again, with regard to " civil practice; if we caſt our eye on any " Digeſt of Laws, we find that evil acti- " ons have their annexed puniſhment de- " nounced, not as they are VICES, *i. e.* " not in proportion to their deviation from " the eternal rule of right: nor as they " are SINS, *i, e.* not in proportion to their " deviation from the extraordinary reveal-

Digitized by Google

" ed will of God; which two things in-
" deed coincide: but as they are CRIMES,
" *i. e.* in proportion to their malignant
" influence on civil Society. But the
" view in which the *State* regards the
" *practice of Morality* is evidently seen in
" its recognition of that famous maxim,
" by which penal laws in all Communi-
" ties are fashioned and directed, THAT
" THE SEVERITY OF THE PUNISHMENT
" MUST ALWAYS RISE IN PROPORTION
" TO THE PROPENSITY TO THE CRIME.
" A maxim evidently *unjust* were actions
" regarded by the the State, just as they
" are in themselves; because the *Law of*
" *Nature* enjoins only in proportion to the
" ability of performance; and human abi-
" lities abate in proportion to the contrary
" propensities: evidently *impious*, were acti-
" ons regarded by the State, as they refer
" to the will of God, because this State-
" measure directly contradicts his method
" and rule of punishing. But suppose the
" Magistrate's office to be what is here
" assigned, and his aim must be the SUP-
" PRESSION of *crimes*, or of those actions
" which malignantly affect society; and

Digitized by Google

" then nothing can be more reaſonable " than this proceeding. For then his end " muſt be the good of the *whole* not of " *particulars*, but as they come within " that view. But the good of the whole " being to be procured only, by the *pre-* " *vention* of crimes, and thoſe to which " there is the greateſt propenſity being of " the moſt difficult prevention, the full " ſeverity of his Laws muſt of neceſſity be " turned againſt theſe [6]."

But, his Lordſhip goes on to tell us, What thoſe *means* are which Princes and Magiſtrates employ to procure this *mediate end* of civil Society, the *Salvation of Souls*; and they are, he ſays, *coercive* force. — *For this purpoſe, the ballance and the ſword are put into their hands, that they may meaſure out puniſhment to every one, who injures the community or does wrong to his neighbour. And a rigorous puniſhment of crimes, eſpecially if it be accompanied with rewards and encouragements to virtue, is the ſureſt way not only to reform the outward behaviour, but to create an inward diſpoſition to the practice of virtue.*

[6] *Alliance*, p. 35—6—7.

Who

Digitized by Google

Who would have expected that it ſhould come at laſt to this, ſo contrary to his Lordſhip's aſſertion in the caſe of an *extraordinary providence*, That a vigorous and exact diſtribution of rewards and puniſhments, under the *Magiſtrate's Providence* (which indeed is the only one his Lordſhip thinks worth a ruſh) ſhould be ſo far from *taking away merit and making virtue ſervile*, that it is the *ſureſt way of creating an inward diſpoſition to the practice of virtue!* i. e. the ſureſt way of making virtue *free* and *meritorious*. But there is ſomething wonderfully perverſe in his Lordſhip's conduct. The exact diſtribution of Rewards and Puniſhments by Heaven, makes virtue worthleſs and ſervile, tho' the adminiſtration of Providence be able to operate on the mind and intention, the only way, if any, of *creating an inward diſpoſition to the practice of virtue*; that is, of making it free and meritorious. On the contrary, if you will believe him, the exact diſtribution of rewards and puniſhments by the civil Magiſtrate, makes virtue free and meritorious, tho' the Magiſtrate cannot operate on the mind and intention, the only way of *creating an inward diſpo-*

Digitized by Google

ſition to the practice of virtue, that is, of making it free and meritorious.

But to come to the point, which theſe obſervations naturally introduce. The very *means* he aſſigns for the promotion of this imaginary *end*, namely *coercive force*, for *ſalvation of ſouls*, entirely ſubverts his poſition, and ſhews this could be no end of civil Society, ſince the means are in no wiſe calculated to promote the end; it not being action ſimply, that intitles to the favour of God, but action upon adequate motives. Now with theſe, (which reſult into what we call *conſcience*,) *force*, or coertion, is abſolutely inconſiſtent: force may make Hypocrites, but nothing but the rational convictions of religion can make men lovers of Virtue.

Now if it be by ſuch kind of reaſoning as this that the *whole edifice of eccleſiaſtical independency and grandeur may be brought to the ground*, (to uſe his Lordſhip's big language) Church Power was never worth the building.

But to proceed. His Lordſhip tells us next, that, "A clergy might co-operate "with the civil Magiſtrate very uſefully, "no doubt, by exhortations, reproofs, "and

Digitized by Google

" and example. — This they might do as
" aſſiſtants to the civil Magiſtrate, in con-
" cert with him, and in ſubordination to
" him. *To what purpoſe therefore do they*
" *claim and affect independency on him?*
" Greater power never did, nor can ena-
" ble them to do greater good. Would
" they erect a tribunal to *puniſh inten-*
" *tions?* The very pretence is imper-
" tinent. Would they erect it to *puniſh*
" *where no injury is offered, nor wrong*
" *done?* The deſign is unjuſt and arbitrary.
" The ideas of crimes are determinate and
" fixed. The Magiſtrate cannot alter them.
" The ideas of Sins are more confuſed and
" vague; and we know by long and ge-
" neral experience, how they vary in the
" minds, or at leaſt in the writings of ca-
" ſuiſts. Would they erect ſuch a tribu-
" nal *to try the orthodoxy of man's faith?*
" Such a one is erected in ſome countries,
" under the name of the Inquiſition, and
" is juſtly deteſted in all. To what end
" and purpoſe then can SPIRITUAL COURTS
" and COERCIVE POWERS ATTRIBUTED
" TO THE CLERGY ſerve, unleſs it be to
" make them judges and parties in their

Digitized by Google

" own cauſe, when matters of intereſt are
" concerned [7]?"

His Lordſhip it muſt be remembered, is here reaſoning with the Author of the *Alliance* againſt his notions of the rights of a Clergy in an eſtabliſhed Church. And the noble perſon's firſt miſrepreſentation, you ſee, is, that this Author holds, that the Clergy remain independent on the State *during* their eſtabliſhment; and that the coercive power exerciſed by them, under the Alliance, is *inherent* in their order. *To what purpoſe* (ſays his Lordſhip) *do they* [the Clergy] CLAIM AND AFFECT *independency on him, the civil Magiſtrate?* And again, *To what end and purpoſe can ſpiritual Courts, and coercive powers,* ATTRIBUTED *to the Clergy, ſerve?* And, as if this was not plain enough, in the very next page, addreſſing himſelf to POPE, he ſays, " Amongſt all the fallacies which
" have been employed by Churchmen,
" one of the moſt abſurd has been ad-
" vanced, tho' not invented, by a paradoxi-
" cal Acquaintance of yours; and it is to
" maintain the INDEPENDENCY of the
" Church, and to ſuppoſe, AT THE SAME
" TIME, a ſort of original Contract be-

[7] Vol. iv. p. 415—16.

" tween

"tween the Church and State, the terms of "which, every whimsical Writer, EVEN "THIS SCRIBLER, adjusts as he pleases [8]." Falshood and ill language commonly go together.

You shall now hear what the Author of the *Alliance* holds on these two points, and from his own mouth. First, as to the *independency*.—"Let us see next (says he) what "the STATE gains by it [the *Alliance*.] "These [advantages] in a word may be "comprized in ITS SUPREMACY IN MATTERS ECCLESIASTICAL. THE CHURCH "RESIGNING UP HER INDEPENDENCY, and "making the Magistrate her SUPREME "HEAD, without whose approbation and "allowance, she can administer, transact, "or decree nothing [9]."

Secondly, as to *coercive power*. "The "third and last PRIVILEGE THE CHURCH "GAINS, by this Alliance, is the being "INTRUSTED WITH A JURISDICTION "INFORCED BY COACTIVE POWER [10]."

His Lordship tells us, the Author of the Alliance holds, that the *independency* of the Church is *retained* in an establish-

[8] Vol. iv. p. 417. [9] *Alliance*, p. 147.
[10] *Alliance*, p. 134.

ment:

Digitized by Google

ment: the Author himſelf, ſays that it is *given up*. His Lordſhip tells us, the Author holds an *inherent coercive power* in the Church: the Author himſelf ſays, that *coercive power is a grant of the State*, during the Alliance.

And here you may take notice, how greatly his Lordſhip has improved upon his Maſters, the Authors of the *Rights of the Chriſtian Church*, and of the *independent Whig*. They had ventured indeed to charge both theſe doctrines on the body of the Engliſh Clergy. But as one can never be ſure what an indiſcreet or corrupt member of ſo large a body may have ſaid, the confutation of this calumny was not eaſy. His Lordſhip is *more bold*, he charges theſe opinions on a particular member of the eſtabliſhed Church, by name: but then he is *more fair*, he puts it in the power of the perſon injured to do himſelf juſtice; for it ſo happens, that this perſon not only denies the *independency* of the Church under an eſtabliſhment, and all claim to *inherent coercive power* whatſoever, but has laid down principles to diſcredit, and rules to prevent the return of thoſe uſurpations. The Author of the *Alliance* has vindicated

Digitized by Google

cated [1] the Engliſh Clergy from the prevarications of TINDAL and GORDON; It had been hard, could he have found no charitable hand to vindicate him from the ſame calumny, when revived by this noble Lord.

As therefore, no *independency* in *alliance*, is either claimed or affected; and no *inherent coercive power is attributed to the clergy*, We will ſuppoſe his Lordſhip's ſimple queſtion to be, "For what end is that tribunal, called a *Spiritual Court*, erected?" And had he been ſo fair to have let the Author of the *Alliance*, to whom he addreſſes his queſtion, ſpeak for himſelf, he would not have waited for an Anſwer. This Author tells us, in the moſt conſpicuous part of his book, and in great letters, that it is FOR REFORMATION OF MANNERS *only* [2]. But, as if he had entirely left us to ourſelves to conjecture how he intended to employ this *ſpiritual tribunal*, his Lordſhip falls a gueſſing: and there is no kind of abſurdity, he does not propoſe, as favoured by the Author of the *Alliance*, tho' they be ſuch as this Author had already exploded.

[1] *Alliance*, p. 81, & ſeq. [2] *Ibid.* p. 134.

To

Digitized by Google

To what purpoſe, ſays his Lordſhip, *do the clergy claim and affect independency on the Magiſtrate? Greater power never did, nor can enable them to do greater good. Would they erect a tribunal to* PUNISH INTENTIONS? *The very pretence is impertinent.*

Before I come to his Lordſhip's *conjecture*, give me leave, Sir, to ſay one word of the happineſs of his *induction*. This *Tribunal*, or this *coercive power*, which he makes to follow independency, is ſo far from being produced by it, that *coercive power* never comes into the Church till it has given up it's *independency*. The Author of the *Alliance* aſſigns a plain reaſon for it.—"The State (ſays he) having, "by this *Alliance*, beſtowed upon the "Clergy a Juriſdiction with *coactive pow-*"*er*, this privilege would create an IM-"PERIUM IN IMPERIO had not the *civil* "*Magiſtrate* in return, the *ſupremacy of* "*the Church* [3]."

And now, to his conjectures. Is it, ſays he, *to puniſh intentions?* The Author of

[3] *Alliance*, p. 149.

the

Digitized by Google

the *Alliance* says, No, it is for *reformation of manners only*. But you understand not half his drift, unless you consider these questions as proposed to insinuate, that the Author of the *Alliance* held the Absurdities contained in them. So here, for instance, you are to understand, that the Author of the *Alliance* held this Tribunal was to *punish intentions*. However, I will acquit his Lordship of malice; it seems to be an innocent blunder. The Author of the *Alliance* did indeed talk of a *Tribunal regarding irregular intentions as criminal*; and by ill luck, his Lordship mistook this tribunal, for a *spiritual Court*. The Author's words are these — "The effectual "correction of such evils [as arise from "the *intemperance of the sensual appetites*] "must be begun by moderating and subduing the Passions themselves. But this, "civil Laws are not understood to prescribe, "as punishing those passions only when "they proceed to act: and not rewarding "the attempts to subdue them. *It must be a* "*tribunal regarding irregular intentions as* "*criminal which can do this; and that is* "*no other than the tribunal of Religion.*

Digitized by Google

" When this is done, a coactive power of " the civil kind may have a good effect, but " not till then. And who ſo proper to apply " this coactive power, in ſuch caſes, as " that Society, which fitted and prepared " the ſubject, for it's due reception and " application [4]." This *tribunal regarding irregular intentions as criminal*, the Author calls the *tribunal of Religion*, (*Forum conſcientiæ*) and diſtinguiſhes it from that tribunal, which is inveſted with *coactive power of the civil kind*, called *ſpiritual Courts*: He makes the firſt a preparative to the other. Yet, ſtrange to believe! his Lordſhip miſtook this *tribunal of Religion*, ſo deſcribed and diſtinguiſhed, for a *ſpiritual Court*: and upbraids the Author of the *Alliance*, for ſupporting a *tribunal with coercive powers, to* PUNISH INTENTIONS. But we ſhall ſee more of his Lordſhip's acuteneſs of this kind, as we go along.

His ſecond charge againſt the principles of the *Alliance* is in theſe words — *Would they erect this tribunal to puniſh, where* NO INJURY IS OFFERED, NOR WRONG DONE? *The deſign is unjuſt and arbitrary. The ideas of crimes are determinate and fixed.*

[4] *Alliance*, p. 99—100.

The

Digitized by Google

The Magiſtrate cannot alter them. The ideas of ſins are more confuſed and vague; and we know by long and general experience, how they vary in the minds, or at leaſt in the writings of Caſuiſts.

To puniſh where no injury is offered nor wrong done, is his Lordſhip's periphraſis of the *puniſhment of vague luſt,* which the Author of the *Alliance* makes one branch of the *reformation of manners,* and conſequently an object of ſpiritual Courts. But his Lordſhip's own opinion of the *quality of vague luſt,* intimated in this periphraſis, is but a ſecond conſideration. His principal ending in giving it, was to diſcredit the tyranny of ſpiritual courts, in puniſhing where no fault is committed. To forget his BIBLE is no diſhonour: but to forget his HORACE is a diſgrace indeed. Now this honeſt Pagan reckons the prohibition of *vague luſt,* as one of the chief purpoſes of *civil laws.*

" Fuit hæc ſapientia quondam
" Publica privatis ſecernere, ſacra prophanis;
" CONCUBITU PROHIBERE VAGO; dare jura
" maritis.

All this is ſo very extraordinary, that you would not readily believe his Lordſhip

ſhip could deſign the *puniſhment of vague luſt*, by the words — *puniſhing where no injury is offered nor wrong done*, did he not ſo clearly explain himſelf, in his curious diſtinction between *crimes* and *ſins*: which, becauſe it was occaſioned by, and alludes to, a paſſage in the *Alliance*, I will firſt beg leave to tranſcribe that paſſage: "If we "caſt our eye on any digeſt of Laws, we "find that evil actions have their annexed "puniſhment denounced, not as they are "VICES, *i. e.* in proportion to their devia-"tion from the eternal rule of right: "nor as they are SINS, *i. e.* not in pro-"portion to their deviation from the ex-"traordinary revealed will of God; which "two things indeed coincide; but as "they are CRIMES, *i. e.* in proportion "to their malignant influence on civil So-"ciety [5]." The Author of the *Alliance* ſaid this, to ſhew that the civil Magiſtrate does not concern himſelf with Religion, *as ſuch*. His Lordſhip borrows the ſame diſtinction between *crimes* and *ſins*, to ſhew that it is *arbitrary and unjuſt* to puniſh *ſins*, as *ſpiritual Courts* undertake to do: for, ſays he, *the ideas of* CRIMES

[5] *Alliance*, p. 35—6.

are

Digitized by Google

are determinate and fixed: The ideas of SINS *are more confused and vague.* From this, it appears, that his Lordship mistook *vices, sins, and crimes,* for different actions: whereas they are the same actions under different considerations, as they respect *natural light, revealed Religion,* or *civil laws*; and so have different names imposed upon them. The *ideas* therefore of these three modifications of forbidden actions are all *equally determinate and fixed,* or *equally confused and vague.* But it comes with a peculiar ill grace from his Lordship to object to the *confused and vague idea of* SINS, since this idea is formed upon the *revealed will of God in the Gospel,* which, in a hundred places of his ESSAYS he tells us, coincides with the *eternal rule of right*; a rule, which he acknowledges to be most determinate and fixed of all things.

But he says, *the Magistrate cannot alter the ideas of crimes, as the Casuist may, the idea of sins.* That is, the Magistrate cannot give the Name of Crimes to innocent actions. What should hinder him? He had two advantages above the Casuist. First *coercive power:* secondly the *vague and confused* measure to which crimes refer;

Digitized by Google

namely, to the *influence of actions on Society.* Matter of fact confirms this obſervation. Look round the World; enquire through antient and modern Times, and you ſhall find, that the *Magiſtrate* has been guilty of infinitely more abuſe in ranging actions under the idea of *Crimes*, than the *Caſuiſt*, in ranging actions under the idea of *Sins.* This was not improper to be obſerved in anſwer to his Lordſhip's *experience*, which uſhers in his old ſophiſm, ready at every turn to do him ſervice, the *abuſe* of the thing for the thing *itſelf—We know*, ſays he, *by long and general experience, how the ideas of ſins vary in the minds, or at leaſt in the* WRITINGS *of caſuiſts.* By which it would ſeem, his Lordſhip knows as little of *Caſuiſts*, as of any other ſort of learned men, whoſe characters he has been ſo free with: For corrupt caſuiſtry does not ſo much conſiſt *in varying the ideas of Sins*, concerning which they are generally agreed, as in contriving to evade the puniſhment denounced againſt them.

His laſt conjecture about the uſe of an eccleſiaſtical Tribunal, on the principles of

Digitized by Google

of the *Alliance*, is, that it is erected for the punishment of opinions. *Would they erect*, says he, *such a tribunal to try the orthodoxy of men's faith?* Why no, says the Author of the ALLIANCE, in as plain words as he can speak; NO MATTERS OF OPINION COME WITHIN THIS SPIRITUAL JURISDICTION [6]: And he not only says it, but proves it too [7]. *To what end and purpose then*, says his Lordship, can *spiritual courts and coercive powers serve, unless it be to make the clergy judges and parties in their own cause, when matters of interest are concerned? — To what end?* The Author of the *Alliance* has told him plainly and directly; FOR THE REFORMATION OF MANNERS ONLY. But such an answer did not serve his Lordship's purpose. He will make the Author say as he would have him, or injoin him silence, and answer for him, himself. He insinuates therefore, in the last place, that the end aimed at is to determine in civil matters where the temporal interest of the Clergy is concerned, and where they become Judges in their own cause. Hear again what the Author of the *Alliance* says upon this head;

[6] *Alliance*, p. 136. [7] P. 137—8.

Digitized by Google

" CIVIL MATTERS, which temporal courts " may conveniently inſpect, can never be- " long to an eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction. It " hath been ſhewn, that this Court was " erected as a ſuccedaneum to the Civil, " to take cognizance of ſuch actions as the " Civil could not reach, or could not re- " medy: which ſhews, the State could " never intend to put thoſe things under " the eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction that fall " moſt conveniently under it's own. Be- " ſides, for eccleſiaſtical Courts to ingroſs " matters that belong to the civil juriſdic- " tion, as it can poſſibly have no good uſe, " may very poſſibly be attended with this " evil, of inviting and encouraging the " Church to aim at more power than is " conſiſtent, either with her own good, " or the good of the State. The great " Founder of our Religion ſaid, *Who made* " *me a Judge or Divider between you?* " And what he would not aſſume to him- " ſelf, he would hardly beſtow upon his " Church: and that the State ſhould ever " intend to give her what was the pecu- " liar right of temporal Courts, is as diffi- " cult to ſuppoſe. We muſt conclude " then, that ſuch practice, wherever it is " found,

Digitized by Google

" found, was derived not from the rea-
" ſonable Laws of this Alliance, but from
" the authority of old papal uſurpa-
" tions [8]." Thus far the Author of the *Alliance*; where you may find a great deal more to the ſame purpoſe.

His Lordſhip goes on with his confutation. — " By admitting the independency
" of the Church on the State, the State
" acknowledges an original independency
" in the Church, derived from a greater
" authority than her own: and the ſup-
" poſed terms of *Union* may be conſtrued
" to be rather conceſſions of the religious
" Society to the civil, for the ſake of or-
" der and peace, than grants of the civil
" to the religious Society. Thus Religi-
" on and the Church are ſet on the ſame
" foot: no human authority can alter
" one, but muſt receive it in *the terms* in
" which it has been revealed; and ſo may
" a good Caſuiſt prove on this hypotheſis,
" that no human authority can meaſure
" out any conditions of Eſtabliſhment to
" the other. Thus the State becomes no
" better than a coordinate, but inferior
" power [9]." I once met with a Phi-

[8] *Alliance*, p. 138—9—40. [6] V. iv. p. 417.

Digitized by Google

loſopher of deep thought, who profeſſed the ſame reverence for *artificial Nonſenſe*, that the Turks pay to *natural Folly*. His Syſtem on this point was very ſingular. He ſuppoſed that, as in the *material* World there was an univerſal, tho' very ſubtile, fire, diffuſed in ſecret thro' all bodies; which, by a late contrivance might be allured or drawn out from the moſt inanimate or lumpiſh Matter, even from the dirty ſhoes of the Chronologer of Leiceſter, who makes Time of Eternity; ſo, in the *intellectual*, that there was a certain witty Spirit, which lay dormant in the moſt inexplicable Nonſenſe; and only wanted the application of ſome Engine of analogous invention to rouſe it, and ſet it free. 'Till ſuch a one be diſcovered, we can but gueſs at his Lordſhip's meaning.

By admitting the independency of the Church on the State, (ſays he) *the State acknowledges an original independency in the Church derived from a greater Authority than her own.* If, by *Church*, he means the chriſtian Church, it is confeſſed that its independency is derived from a greater authority than what the State claims for any of it's rights. But what are the conſequences his Lordſhip draws from

Digitized by Google

from thence? The firſt is, that *then the ſuppoſed terms of union may be conſtrued to be rather conceſſions of the religious Society to the civil, for the ſake of order and peace, than grants of the civil to the religious Society.* The *ſuppoſed terms* are terms of *Alliance* between two independent Societies. Theſe terms cannot, in the nature of things, be any other than *mutual conceſſions* and *mutual grants.* What then does he mean, by their being *conſtrued to be rather conceſſions of the religious Society, than grants of the civil?* By the *ſuppoſition* on which his Lordſhip condeſcends to reaſon, when the Church in *Alliance* gives up its original *independency*, it is without doubt a *conceſſion*; becauſe it is giving up a right. And when the State, in *Alliance*, confers a *coercive power* on the Church, this too, is certainly a *grant*; becauſe an original independent religious Society can have no inherent coercive power. However ſome meaning, it is likely, his Lordſhip had. And it ſeems to be this, " That if the Church has an original independency, no ſuch *Alliance* as is ſuppoſed, could be made: for that the terms on the ſide of the Church, would not be *conditional* but

Digitized by Google

voluntary conceſſions, the State having nothing to give, in return." This would be talking ſenſe at leaſt, tho' not truth. But, to *ſuppoſe* the terms of this Union, which are mutual grants and mutual conceſſions; and then to deny mutual grants and mutual conceſſions, is giving ſuch a form to his argument as will need a *firſt Logic* to turn into ſenſe, as much as the doctrine conveyed under it needs a *firſt Philoſophy* to turn into truth. Thus much however you may ſee, Some cloudy conception his Lordſhip plainly had, that a ſociety of *divine* original could never enter into Alliance with another, only of *human*. When the Sons of God came down amongſt the Daughters of Men, we are told they begot Giants. His Lordſhip betrays his apprehenſions, that this coalition between the civil and religious Societies would produce an iſſue altogether as monſtrous, a kind of STATE LEVIATHAN. Indeed, he charges the Author of the *Alliance* with being no better than a Pander or Procurer in this intrigue. But whatever his apprehenſions were, his conception was very unworthy both of a Philoſopher and a Stateſman. The AUTHOR OF THE ALLIANCE hath ſhewn from

Digitized by Google

from the nature of things that Religion compoſes an independent ſociety: The GOSPEL, by divine inſtitution hath declared the Chriſtian Religion to be an independent ſociety. His LORDSHIP hath ſhewn, from the nature of things, that civil wants create an independent ſociety of the civil kind: And the LAW, by divine inſtitution, hath declared the Jewiſh Republic to be an independent civil ſociety. Now I would aſk his Lordſhip, if nothing hindered this *civil Society of divine Original*, from entering into leagues and conventions with all the neighbouring nations, which were not, for political reaſons, excepted by name, what ſhould hinder this *religious Society of divine original*, from entering into Alliance with the State?

Another Conſequence which his Lordſhip draws from an original independency in the Church is, that RELIGION *and the* CHURCH *are ſet on the ſame foot.* That is, as I underſtand him, for he might have expreſſed himſelf better, the DISCIPLINE of the Church is as unalterable as the DOCTRINE. The conſequence of which is, that the *State muſt receive the* CHURCH *on the terms in which it was revealed.* From whence ariſes another

other conſequence, that *no human Authority can meaſure out any conditions of eſtabliſhment to the Church:* and, from thence another, (for his Lordſhip's falſe conceptions are always attended with ſuperfetations,) that the *State becomes an inferior Power, or Creature to the Church.* All theſe brave conſequences, we ſee, ariſe out of this principle, " that, in a Church of Divine Original, the *Diſcipline* is as unalterable as the *Doctrine.*" And of the truth of this principle his Lordſhip is ſo confident, that he calls his Adverſary a *ſtupid Fellow* for not ſeeing it. " The STUPID FELLOW, who ad-
" vanced this Paradox in Engliſh, did not
" ſee how ill the parts of it hang toge-
" ther, nor that if eccleſiaſtical Govern-
" ment was, by divine appointment, in-
" dependent of civil, no ſuch contract as
" he ſuppoſes could be made. The reli-
" gious ſociety, notwithſtanding their
" known moderation, could not have part-
" ed from that independency, *and ſuperio-*
" *rity* over the civil power, which God
" had given them [10]."

It is true, this *ſtupid Fellow* did not ſee it. And I don't well know how

[10] Vol. iv. p. 418.

he

Digitized by Google

he ſhould; ſince, on the other hand, he ſaw it to be impoſſible that any *ſuch contract as he ſuppoſes* could be made, unleſs the Church or religious Society was *independent* of the civil. For what *contract* is it, which this Author ſuppoſes to have been made between Church and State? He tells us, in expreſs words, it is a *mutual compact by* FREE CONVENTION [1]. Now the entering into a *free convention* is at the pleaſure of the contracting parties. But Parties who have this liberty, muſt needs be *independent* on one another.

Well, but he has his reaſon, ſuch as it is, to confound this STUPID FELLOW. *The Religious Society* (ſays he) *could not have parted from that independency*, AND SUPERIORITY, *over the civil Power, which God had given them.* And now indeed, after much cloudy flouriſhing, we are come to the point: which is, WHETHER A RELIGIOUS SOCIETY CAN PART WITH THAT INDEPENDENCY WHICH GOD, *as well as the nature of things*, HATH BESTOWED UPON IT? This is in truth a queſtion worth debating. But as his Lordſhip rarely ſuffers an important propoſition,

[1] *Alliance*, p. 87.

which

Digitized by Google

which he is ſet either upon denying or depraving, to paſs thro' his hands without firſt clouding it in the expreſſion with an abſurdity or an equivocation, I ſhall be obliged, before we can paſs forward, to free this from the Bolingbrokian embarraſs. *The religious Society* (ſays he) *could not have parted from that independency* AND SUPERIORITY *over the civil power, which God hath given them.* Now as the Author of the *Alliance* contends only for the *independency* of the Church *before Alliance*, and as his Lordſhip's reaſoning acknowledges that the queſtion is only concerning this very independency, he muſt needs ſuppoſe, by adding, AND SUPERIORITY *over the civil*, that this *ſuperiority* is a conſequence of *independency*. And ſo, indeed, he ſpeaks of it more plainly juſt before, — *Thus,* [i. e. from the *independency* of the Church] *the State becomes no better than a coordinate,* BUT INFERIOR, *Power*. Now if we judge of this matter on the principles of the Law of Nature and Nations, *ſuperiority* is ſo far from following *independency*, that it cannot ſubſiſt with it. For why is religious Society by nature *independent*, (as the Author of the *Alliance* ſhews it is) but for

Digitized by Google

for the reaſon that Author gives, that it is *eſſentially different* from the civil, *by having different ends and means* [2].'' But there is no ground for ſuperiority of one Perſon or Society over another, but where ſome natural relation or connexion exiſts between them: none exiſts in this caſe; therefore a pretence of *ſuperiority* on the one ſide, and of *dependency* on the other, is abſurd. However, as I am verily perſuaded his Lordſhip did not know enough of theſe matters even to prevaricate neatly, in the point in queſtion, I conſider it as an innocent miſtake, ariſing from the following words of the *Alliance*, ſhamefully indeed, miſunderſtood.—

" Such then is the nature of Chriſt's king-
" dom [*i. e.* the chriſtian Church] it is eſſen-
" tially framed to compoſe a firm and laſting
" Society; it is made ſuch by divine appoint-
" ment, and in order to fit it for public ſer-
" vice, it is both by nature and inſtitution
" declared SOVEREIGN, and *independent* of
" civil Government, that it may adapt it-
" ſelf by *free Alliance* to the various kinds
" of human Policies [3]." Now *ſove-
" reign and independent of civil govern-
" ment*, this great Writer has paraphraſed

[2] *Alliance*, p. 65. [3] *Ibid.* p. 180.

to

Digitized by Google

to ſignify, *independency and ſuperiority over the civil.*

But the queſtion itſelf, WHETHER A RELIGIOUS SOCIETY CAN PART WITH THAT INDEPENDENCY, WHICH GOD, *as well as the Nature of things*, HATH BESTOWED UPON IT, his Lordſhip determines in the negative. *For if*, ſays he, *eccleſiaſtical Government was by divine appointment independent of the civil, the Religious Society could not have parted with that independency which God had given them.*

Man was, by *divine appointment*, created *free and independent*, therefore, according to this reaſoning, he could not part with his *independency*, and become ſubject to civil Laws. Hold, ſays his Lordſhip, Man was created free, that he might be ſubject to no civil laws but thoſe to which he had given his conſent; and he had a right to part with his independency in order to procure protection. And is not this the very caſe of Religious Society, which is only an artificial perſon, by nature free, and ſtanding in need of protection?

But his Lordſhip's aſſertion, you will find, bottoms at laſt upon this Principle, that DIVINE AUTHORITY REDUCES ALL IT's

Digitized by Google

IT'S LAWS TO ONE AND THE SAME SPECIES: An Error which *Bigots* and *Fanatics* indeed, are equally fond of indulging, to the infinite diſſervice both of civil and of religious Society: But that a *philoſopher* and a *Stateſman* ſhould know ſo little of the NATURE OF LAWS is perfectly aſtoniſhing. The firſt elements of his profeſſion might have taught him, "That the authority by which a thing is commanded makes no alteration in the eſſence of the thing." Natural and poſitive duties retain their reſpective eſſences in the Code of Religion. Natural duties are eternal; poſitive duties revocable. Of theſe latter, ſome are laſting as the diſpenſation to which they belong; others temporary. Of the temporary, ſome ceaſe not till expreſly revoked; others ceaſe with the occaſion that enjoined them. Theſe laſt are again to be diſtinguiſhed into privileges and duties; privileges may be receded from at pleaſure; but duties muſt either be revoked, or the occaſion muſt be plainly ſeen to ceaſe. Now the INDEPENDENCY, in queſtion, is one of thoſe inſtitutions in the divine Law, which ceaſes with the occaſion; and is beſides a privilege,

Digitized by Google

ledge, which may be receded from, at pleaſure. Again, In the divine Laws, ſome things are enjoined to be believed as truths; others to be practiſed as utilities. Of utilities ſome are general; others particular: The firſt of theſe are permanent and conſtant; the ſecond variable. Of the firſt, is the Churches compoſing a *Society*: of the ſecond, is the *particular form*. Thus, Jeſus ſeemed to inſtitute an equal miniſtry; the Apoſtles, epiſcopal Government; and modern Churches, both one and the other, as beſt ſuited to the various civil Governments with which they had allied.

As Chriſtianity was, by divine inſtitution, a *ſociety at large*, to authorize and to enable the ſeveral Churches to give particular forms to eccleſiaſtical Government; ſo the *independency* was beſtowed upon it, to enable it to enter into free Alliance with the State. When God himſelf allied the Jewiſh Church with the State, he left not that Religion a *ſociety at large*, neither did he ordain it *independent*: he preſcribed in the minuteſt manner the form of Church Government, and made it dependent on the State. But the Author of the *Alliance*

Digitized by Google

tells his ſtory better. " The chriſtian re-
" ligion (ſays he) was not only left *inde-*
" *pendent* of the State by not being united
" to it like the Jewiſh; (and being ſo
" left it muſt needs by the Law of nature
" be independent) but its independency
" was likewiſe ſecured by divine appoint-
" ment, in that famous declaration of it's
" founder, *My kingdom is not of this world*;
" which bears this plain and obvious ſenſe,
" *That the kingdom of Chriſt, to be extended*
" *over all Mankind, was not like the king-*
" *dom of God, confined to the Jewiſh people,*
" *where Religion was incorporated with the*
" *State*; *and therefore*, of this world, *as*
" *well in the exerciſe of it, as in the re-*
" *wards and puniſhments by which it was*
" *adminiſtered: but was independent of all*
" *civil communities*; *and therefore, neither*
" of this world, *as to the exerciſe of it, nor*
" *as to the rewards and puniſhments by which*
" *it was adminiſtered.*— But whoever ima-
" gines that from this *independency by in-*
" *ſtitution*, the Church cannot convene
" and unite with the State, concludes
" much too faſt. We have obſerved, that
" this property in the *Kingdom of Chriſt*
" was given as a mark to diſtinguiſh it

Digitized by Google

" from the *kingdom of God*, that is, it was
" given to ſhew that this Religion ex-
" tended to all mankind; and was not,
" like the Moſaic, confined to one only
" people. Conſequently, that very rea-
" ſon which made it proper for the Mo-
" ſaic Religion to be united, by divine ap-
" pointment, to the State, made it fit,
" the Chriſtian ſhould be left free and in-
" dependent. But for what end, if not
" for this, To be at liberty to adapt itſelf
" to the many various kinds of civil poli-
" cies, by a ſuitable union and alliance.
" —An Alliance then we muſt conclude
" the chriſtian Church was at liberty to
" make, notwithſtanding this declared na-
" ture of *Chriſt's kingdom*. So far is true
" indeed, that it is debarred from entering
" into any ſuch *Alliance* with the State as
" may admit any LEGISLATOR in Chriſt's
" kingdom but himſelf [that is, a power in
" the Magiſtrate to alter *doctrines*.] But
" no ſuch power is granted or uſurped by
" the *ſupremacy* of the State [4]." [which extends only to DISCIPLINE.

From all this it appears, that the unalterable part of the Law of Chriſt is

[4] *Alliance*, p. 178—9, &c.

the

Digitized by Google

the DOCTRINE: and the only *alterable* part, the DISCIPLINE: but it is the latter, with which Society, as ſuch, is chiefly concerned, when it enters on *Alliance* with the Church. Therefore, when his Lordſhip ſays, *Religion and the Church being ſet on the ſame foot, no human authority can alter one, but muſt receive it on the terms in which it has been revealed,* if he means, there can be no alteration in *diſcipline*, I have ſhewn he is miſtaken: if he means, there can be no alteration in *doctrine*, he is certainly right; and I conſider his Lordſhip's obſervation as a complaint, that, by the conſtitution of the Chriſtian Church, the Magiſtrate cannot tyrannize over Conſcience.

In the mean time we ſee to what little purpoſe this great Philoſopher and Stateſman had read his HOOKER; of whom he confeſſes ſomething might be learnt. Now, HOOKER would have ſhewn him, that divine authority does not reduce all it's Laws to one and the ſame ſpecies. — "Poſitive "Laws (ſays this truly great Man) are ei-"ther permanent or elſe changeable, ac-"cording as the matter itſelf is, concern-

Digitized by Google

" ing which they were firſt made. Whe-
" ther GOD or MAN be the maker of them,
" ALTERATION they ſo far forth admit, as
" the MATTER doth exact. Wherefore,
" to end with a general rule concerning all
" the Laws which God hath tied men un-
" to: thoſe Laws divine, that belong,
" whether naturally or ſupernaturally, ei-
" ther to men as men, or to men as they
" live in politique Society, or to men as
" they are of that politique Society which
" is the Church, without any further re-
" ſpect had unto any ſuch variable acci-
" dent as the State of men, and of Socie-
" ties of men, and of the Church itſelf in
" this world, is ſubject unto; all Laws that
" ſo belong unto men, they belong for
" ever, yea altho' they be poſitive Laws,
" unleſs, being poſitive, God himſelf which
" made them alter them. The reaſon is,
" becauſe the ſubject or matter of Laws in
" general, is thus far forth conſtant:
" which matter is that for the ordering
" whereof, Laws were inſtituted, and be-
" ing inſtituted are not changeable with-
" out cauſe, neither can they have cauſe
" of change, when that which gave them
" their firſt inſtitution remaineth for ever

" one

Digitized by Google

" one and the ſame. *On the other ſide,* " *Laws that were made for men, or Socie-* " *ties, or Churches, in regard of their be-* " *ing ſuch as do not always continue, but* " *may perhaps be clean otherwiſe a-while af-* " *ter, and ſo may be required to be other-* " *wiſe ordered than before; the Laws of* " *God himſelf which are of this nature,* NO " MAN ENDOWED WITH COMMON SENSE " *will ever deny to be of a different con-* " *ſtitution from the former, in reſpect of* " *the one's conſtancy, and the mutability of* ' *the other* [5]."

Thus far this country Parſon. And how meanly does his Lordſhip figure before him with his aſſertion, that *divine law makes every thing, which relates to the Church, equally unalterable?* Yet this noble perſon, thus ignorant of the very firſt elements of Law, can harangue, with the air and authority of an Oracle, on a *patriot king*, on *civil liberty*, on *Church Tyranny*, and on the *ballance of power*. Maſter Hooker will tell you, how eaſily all this may be done without knowing more than our neighbours.

[5] *Eccl. Pol.* L. i. Sect. 15.

Digitized by Google

—" Thus far therefore (ſays he) we " have endeavoured, in part, to open, of " what nature and force laws are, accord- " ing unto their ſeveral kinds: the Law " which God himſelf hath eternally ſet " down to follow in his own works; the " Law which he hath made for his crea- " tures to keep; the Law of natural and " neceſſary Agents; the law which angels " in Heaven obey; the Law whereunto, " by the light of reaſon, men find them- " ſelves bound, in that they are men; " the Law which they made by compoſi- " tion for multitudes and politique Socie- " ties of men to be guided by; the Law " which belongeth unto each nation; the " Law that concerneth the fellowſhip of " all; and laſtly the Law which God " himſelf hath ſupernaturally revealed. " *It might peradventure have been more* " POPULAR AND MORE PLAUSIBLE TO " VULGAR EARS, *if this diſcourſe had been* " *ſpent in* EXTOLLING THE FORCE OF " LAWS, *in ſhewing the* GREAT NECESSI- " TY OF THEM, *when they are* GOOD, " and in AGGRAVATING THEIR OF- " FENCE BY WHOM PUBLIC LAWS ARE " INJURIOUSLY TRADUCED. *But for-*

Digitized by Google

" *aſmuch as with ſuch kind of matter* THE " PASSIONS OF MEN *are rather ſtirred one* " *way or other, than* THEIR KNOWLEDGE " *any way ſet forward* unto the trial of " that whereof there is doubt made, I " have therefore turned aſide from that " BEATEN PATH, and choſen, tho' a " LESS EASY, yet a more profitable way, " in regard of the end we propoſe [6]."

Great Names, however, are ſtill of great ſervice to his Lordſhip: for tho' he cannot profit by their lights, he can ſhine at their expence: and, having well chicaned their expreſſions, can convert the truths, contained in them, to his own uſe. Let me give you, out of many, one example of this kind. HOOKER and LOCKE have been ſuppoſed to write tolerably well on the origin of civil Government. Alas! *nil ſine Theſeo.* There is nothing ſo well done, which his Lordſhip cannot mend. He reproves Both of them, with much ſolemnity, for *repreſenting mankind to themſelves, like a number of ſavage individuals out of Society, in their natural State, inſtead of conſidering them as members of families from their birth.* " This (he ſays) has made

[6] *Eccl. Pol.* L. i. Sect. 16.

" them reaſon INCONSISTENTLY, and on
" a FALSE FOUNDATION. *Inconſiſtently*,
" becauſe they ſometimes acknowledge pa-
" ternal Government to have preceded
" civil, and yet reaſon about the inſtituti-
" on of civil, as if men had then firſt
" aſſembled in any kind of ſociety, or had
" been ſubject to any kind of rule; for
" to ſay that the Law of nature was of it-
" ſelf ſuch a rule, and that every one of
" theſe independent inhabitants of the
" earth did or might exerciſe Juſtice for
" himſelf, and others on thoſe who violat-
" ed the Law, was language unworthy of
" Mr. LOCKE, and unneceſſary to his Syſ-
" tem. — *Falſely*, becauſe it is eaſy to de-
" monſtrate that mankind never was in
" ſuch a State [7]."

To ſay the truth, *eaſy* enough, and like *demonſtrating* day-light. A man need only open his eyes to ſee that a Mother does not abandon her infant, as ſoon as ſhe has dropt it, nor the Father renounce the care of them. Is it poſſible then that HOOKER, LOCKE and their Followers, ſhould want, to be told by his Lordſhip ſo obvious a truth, " That, before civil Society, man-

[7] Vol. v. p. 125—6.

kind

Digitized by Google

kind ſtarted not up like muſhrooms, a number of ſavage individuals, but lived in tribes and families." Why then, you aſk, did not HOOKER and LOCKE ſo conſider them, when they were deducing the origin of civil Society? For two very important reaſons; and, one would think, very obvious ones.

Firſt becauſe the real origin of civil Society appearing equally on either ſuppoſition, the truths, which followed from it, were clearer ſeen, as leſs embarraſſed, by conſidering mankind before civil Society as individuals.

But this was not all. Had They conſidered men before civil ſociety as ranked under tribes, the rights belonging to the Heads of families, thus brought into view, tho' neither relative to, nor connected with, thoſe of a civil kind, might have given too much countenance, to that abſurd Syſtem, which derives political Rule from the *Patriarchal*; a ſyſtem which, both for its abſurdities and miſchiefs, it was the purpoſe of LOCKE and HOOKER to diſcredit. The former therefore did judiciouſly to aſſert (as he might do it truly; for the *exerciſe of juſtice* no more belonged to Fathers of

of Families, as ſuch, than the *exerciſe of Regal prerogative*) that, before the inſtitution of Civil Society, *every one of theſe independent inhabitants of the earth did, or might, exerciſe juſtice for himſelf and others, on thoſe who violated the Law.* Yet this, his Lordſhip calls language unworthy of his Maſter. Nay, ſo great a ſtranger is he to this whole matter, that he declares the repreſentation to be UNNECESSARY: whereas we ſee it was done to keep the unwary from being miſled by the ſight of circumſtances of no uſe to aſſiſt an honeſt man's judgment, and which knaves might wreſt to the ſupport of error.

---But to proceed with our Subject. His Lordſhip goes on againſt the Book of the *Alliance* in this Manner: "This imaginary Contract, in ſhort, whether well or "ill made, never exiſted at any time, nor "in any Country; though, to have been "real, and really authorized, it ſhould "have been the ſame at all times and in "all Countries where Chriſtianity was propagated. Political Societies make and "alter and break their *Alliances*, as the varying reaſon of ſtate ſuggeſts. Different "orders of civil Government in the ſame

"Society

" Society change, and with them the
" whole Conſtitution of ſuch Governments,
" as reaſon or paſſion, the intereſts or the
" diſpoſitions of men determine them. *But*
" *a Religion given by God is in its nature*
" *invariable.* And therefore if a Religi-
" ous Society with certain privileges,
" immunities, and prerogatives be neceſſary
" to preſerve it ſo, the *order and conſtitu-*
" *tion* of ſuch a Society muſt be *invariable*
" too. The Church muſt be eſtabliſhed
" by the ſame divine Authority as the Re-
" ligion, and be by conſequence independ-
" ent of the State. But nothing of this
" kind has been. Chriſt's *Kingdom was*
" *not of this World.* He ſent out his A-
" poſtles to teach, and to baptize; and
" the utmoſt power he gave them, beſides
" that of working Miracles to convince and
" to convert, was to ſhake off the duſt of
" their feet, and to proteſt againſt the in-
" fidelity of thoſe who refuſed to receive
" them, and the Goſpel they publiſhed.
" The Apoſtles ordained others to accom-
" pany and to ſucceed them in the ſame
" office, the office of teaching and baptiz-
" ing. The Apoſtles could give no more
" power than they received; and no ar-

" gument

" gument *of right* can be drawn from any " thing that paſſed, or from any thing " that theſe Men did for the Maintenance " of their Sect, while Chriſtianity was a " Sect [8.]"

This imaginary Contract (he ſays) *never exiſted at any time or in any country.* If he means, a *Contract* actually and formally executed, I have given an anſwer to that already, and have ſhewn, that the objection holds equally againſt *the original contract between King and People*; which I ſuppoſe his Lordſhip deems not to be altogether ſo *imaginary* but that the *prerogative* of the one, and the *rights* of the other, ought every where to be regulated on the principles there laid down. But you ſhall hear the Author of the *Alliance* on this matter.

" [9] When I ſay that *all* regular polici- " ed States had *an Eſtabliſhed Religion*, I " mean no more than He would do, who, " deducing Civil Society from its true O- " riginal, ſhould, in order to perſuade " Men of the Benefits it produces, affirm " that all Nations had a *Civil Policy*. For " as this Writer could not be ſuppoſed to

[8] Vol. iv. p. 419—20. [9] *Alliance*, p. 114—117.

" mean

" mean that every one conſtituted a free
" State, on the Principles of public Liber-
" ty, which yet was the only Society he
" purpoſed to prove was founded on Truth,
" and productive of public Good; becauſe
" it is notorious, that the far greater Part
" of Civil Policies are founded on different
" Principles; or abuſed to different Ends:
" ſo neither would I be underſtood to
" mean, when I ſay all Nations concurred
" in making this *Union*, that they all ex-
" actly diſcriminated the Natures, and
" fairly adjuſted the Rights of both Socie-
" ties, on the Principles here laid down;
" tho' an *Eſtabliſhment* reſulting from this
" Diſcrimination and Adjuſtment be the
" only one I would be ſuppoſed to recom-
" mend. On the contrary, I know this
" Union has been generally made on miſta-
" ken Principles; or, if not ſo, hath de-
" generated in length of Time; by which
" means the National Religion in the Pa-
" gan World hath been moſt commonly a
" Slave to the State; and in the Chriſtian
" Syſtem, the State ſometimes a Slave to
" the Eſtabliſhed Church. And as it was ſuffi-
" cient for that Writer's Purpoſe, that thoſe
" Societies, whether good or bad, proved the
" Senſe

Digitized by Google

" Senſe all Men had of the Benefits re-
" ſulting from Civil Policy in general,
" though they were oft miſtaken in the
" Application; ſo it is for Ours, that this
" univerſal Concurrence in the two Socie-
" ties to *unite*, ſhews the Senſe Mankind
" had of the Uſefulneſs of ſuch an *Union*.
" And laſtly, as that Writer's Principles
" are not the leſs true on account of the
" general Deviation from them in forming
" Civil Societies; ſo may not the plain
" ones of *Alliance* here delivered; tho' ſo
" few States have ſuffered themſelves to be
" directed by them in Practice; nor any
" Man before delivered them in Specula-
" tion; eſpecially if, as in that Caſe, ſo in
" *this*, we can derive ſuch *Miſtake* and
" *Degeneracy* from their Cauſes. It would
" draw me too far out of my Way to ex-
" plain diſtinctly the Cauſes of the *Miſtake*;
" and the intelligent Reader, who care-
" fully attends to the whole of this Diſ-
" courſe, will not be at a Loſs to diſcover
" the moſt conſiderable of them; ſome of
" which I have already hinted at; and
" others, I may poſſibly, in the Sequel of
" this Diſcourſe, take occaſion to mention.
" As for the *Degeneracy*, we have obſerv-
" ed,

Digitized by Google

" ed, that the *Alliance* is of the Nature of " the FOEDERA INÆQUALIA: Now, the " common Iſſue of ſuch, *Grotius* acquaints " us with, in theſe Words: *Interim verum* " *eſt accidere plerumque, ut qui ſuperior eſt* " *in fœdere,* SI IS POTENTIA MULTUM " ANTECELLAT, PAULATIM IMPERIUM " PROPRIE DICTUM USURPET: PRÆSER- " TIM SI FOEDUS PERPETUUM SIT [9.]"

But if, by, *never exiſted*, his Lordſhip means, that the mutual rights and privileges of either Society, which naturally follow ſuch an *Alliance*, were never actually exerciſed and enjoyed by the two Societies, his aſſertion is falſe. They are at this preſent actually exerciſed and enjoyed by the two Societies, in ENGLAND, under our happy Conſtitution of Church and State. And it was a principal purpoſe of the Book of the *Alliance* to ſhew they are ſo, in order to realize the Theory. Here again it may not be improper to give you the Author's words: " We ſee how unreaſonable and " even how impolitic our Adverſaries are, " when in their ill humour with *Eſtabliſh-* " *ments*, they chuſe to pick a quarrel with " their own; where the natural Religion

[9] *De jure Belli & Pacis*, Lib. i. cap. iii. § 21.

" is

" is on a footing exactly agreeable to the " nature of a *free Convention between* " *Church and State*, on the principles of " the Laws of Nature and Nations. A " felicity, they ſhould have known, that " ſcarce any other People on the face of " the earth can boaſt of. In *England* " alone the original terms of this *Conven-* " *tion* are kept up to ſo exactly, that this " account of the *Alliance between Church* " *and State* ſeems rather a copy of the " Church and State of *England*, than a " Theory, as indeed it was, formed ſolely " on the contemplation of Nature, and " the unvariable reaſon of things [10.]

To make this contract (ſays his Lordſhip) *real, and to be really authorized, it ſhould have been the ſame at all times and in all countries where Chriſtianity was profeſſed.* In other words, " *Right* muſt receive " it's nature from *Fact:*" or, in ſtill plainer terms, " Right becomes *Wrong* " when rejected, and *Wrong* becomes " *Right* when received." How would this ſound when applied to the ORIGINAL CONTRACT between Prince and People? —*to make it real and to be really authorized,*

[10] *Alliance*, p. 167-8.

it

it ſhould have been the ſame at all times and in all countries, where civil rule had been introduced.

But *political Societies* (he ſays) *make and alter and break their alliances as the varying reaſon of ſtate ſuggeſts.* If he only ſpeaks of ſuch which make theſe *alterations* juſtly, it is the ſame in the *Alliance between Church and State.* The Author has ſhewn that, in this reſpect, the Alliances of political Societies with one another, and the Alliance of the political with the religious, ſtand juſt upon the ſame footing. " If there be (ſays " the Author) more religious Societies than " one at the time of Convention, the State " allies itſelf with the largeſt of thoſe religi- " ous Societies. It is *fit* the State ſhould do " ſo, becauſe the larger the religious Society " is, where there is an equality in other points, " the better enabled it will be to anſwer " the ends of the Alliance. It is *ſcarce* " *poſſible* it ſhould be otherwiſe, becauſe " the two Societies being compoſed of the " ſame individuals, the greatly prevailing " Religion muſt have a majority of it's " members in the aſſemblies of State, who " will naturally prefer their own religion " to any other. Hence we ſee the reaſon

Digitized by Google

" why the *Epiſcopal* is the eſtabliſhed
" Church in *England*; and the *Preſbyte-*
" *rian* the eſtabliſhed Church in *Scotland*.
" Hence too we ſee the reaſon of what was
" before obſerved, concerning the durati-
" on of this Alliance: that it is *perpetual*
" but not *irrevocable:* i. e. It ſubſiſts juſt
" ſo long as the Church, thereby eſtab-
" liſhed, maintains it's ſuperiority of ex-
" tent; which when it loſes to any conſi-
" derable degree, the Alliance becomes
" void. For the united Church being
" then no longer able to perform it's part
" of the Convention, which is formed on
" reciprocal conditions, the State becomes
" diſengaged: and a *new Alliance* is of
" courſe contracted with the now prevail-
" ing Church, for the reaſons which made
" the *old*. Thus formerly, the Alliance
" between the *Pagan Church* and the Em-
" pire of Rome was diſſolved; and the
" *Chriſtian* eſtabliſhed in it's place: and
" of late, the Alliance between the *Popiſh*
" *Church* and the Kingdom of England
" was broken; and another made with
" the *Proteſtant*, in it's ſtead [1.]"

[1] *Alliance*, p. 197-98.

Different

Digitized by Google

Different orders of civil government, in the ſame Society, change, (ſays his Lordſhip) *and with them the whole Conſtitution of ſuch Governments, as reaſon or paſſion, the intereſts or diſpoſitions of men determine them.* And is it not the ſame in Church-Government? It is here *Epiſcopacy*; there *Preſbytery*; and in another place *Independency*.

But, *a Religion given by God is in its nature invariable.* In its DOCTRINE it is confeſſed to be ſo. Yes, and in its DISCIPLINE likewiſe, (ſays his Lordſhip) and thus ſtands my argument, *If a religious Society with certain privileges, immunities, and prerogatives, be neceſſary to preſerve it ſo, the order and conſtitution of ſuch a Society muſt be invariable too.* The inference is juſt. But who, that holds the principles of the *Alliance*, againſt which his Lordſhip is here arguing, ever ſuppoſed, that *one certain ſet of privileges, immunities and prerogatives* was neceſſary to preſerve a religious Society in that State and Condition? They ſay, Religion compoſed a Society before it had any of thoſe *privileges, immunities and prerogatives*; none of which it had till it came into Alliance with the State; and none of which

Digitized by Google

it holds longer than the Alliance laſts. But, if by a ſtrange liberty of expreſſion, his Lordſhip means, by *privileges, immunities and prerogatives*, only CHURCH-GOVERNMENT in general, ſo far forth as it is a Society; I own that this is *neceſſary to preſerve a religious Society* in the State and Condition of a Society: But then, give me leave to ſay, it does not follow from thence, that *the order and conſtitution of ſuch a Society muſt be invariable too:* Becauſe Church Government may be adminiſtred by an Epiſcopacy, a Preſbytery, or an Independency. The Specific form of Church-Government amongſt the Jews was preſcribed, and therefore intended to be invariable, becauſe Moſes united the Religion to the State, under the collective name of LAW: The ſpecific form of Church-Government amongſt Chriſtians was not preſcribed, and therefore none ſeems intended to be invariably followed, becauſe Jeſus did not unite his Religion to the State, but left it to particular Churches to follow ſuch as was moſt agreeable to the forms of thoſe civil Societies, in which they were to be eſtabliſhed. For this purpoſe it was ſufficient that he inſtituted his Religion, a *Society*, by directing the members

Digitized by Google

members of it to *hear the Church*, and by appointing Officers as its organs to convey it's deciſions. On this matter it may not be improper again to hear the Author of the *Alliance*, who ſpeaking of the *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian* Churches, has theſe words: "This, Both had in common, to be poli-"tical Societies by divine appointment; "but different in this, that GOD, for *wiſe* "*ends*, minutely preſcribed the whole mode "of Jewiſh policy: and CHRIST, on the "contrary, with the ſame divine wiſdom "only conſtituted his Church a policied "Society in general; and left the mode "of it to human diſcretion [2]."

Thoſe *ends*, the Author thus explains, in another place. "The *Jewiſh* Religion "was, like the true *natural*, which it rati-"fied, eſſentially fitted to compoſe a So-"ciety; and like the *Chriſtian*, of which it "was the firſt rudiment, really ſuch by "divine appointment. But then unlike "the Chriſtian, in this, that it was not "left independent of civil Government, "to unite with it at its pleaſure, on terms "agreed upon; but was for great and "wiſe reaſons inſtantaneouſly united to it,

[2] *Alliance*, p. 164.

Digitized by Google

"by God himſelf. Which alſo he was "pleaſed to do, not by way of *Alliance* as "between two bodies that were to continue "diſtinct, but by mutual converſion into one "another, and perfect incorporation [3]."

His Lordſhip then owns, that if *the Church be eſtabliſhed by the ſame divine authority as the religion*, (that is, if religion be formed by it into a Society) *it is by conſequence independent of the State*. I am apt to ſuſpect, he here grants more than he is aware of: For it follows from this conceſſion, that if the Chriſtian Religion even compoſes a Society by nature, tho' not by divine appointment, it muſt be *independent* of the State: becauſe the *independency* does not ariſe from the *Authority* which formed it, but from the *nature* eſſential to it. And the Author of the Alliance has ſhewn [4] that Religion compoſes a Society by natural right. His Lordſhip's endeavour therefore to avoid the *conſequence* of *independency*, by affirming that *the Church was not eſtabliſhed by the ſame divine authority as the Religion*, would be to no purpoſe even tho' he could prove it. However let us hear how he ſupports his opinion.

[3] *Alliance*, p. 176. [4] Book i. c. 5.

His

Digitized by Google

His firſt argument is the declaration of Jeſus himſelf, that *his Kingdom was not of this World.* The very argument employed by the Author of the *Alliance*, to prove the contrary. The queſtion is, whether Chriſt's Religion compoſes a Society; and his Lordſhip quotes a declaration of our Saviour, to prove it does not; which, by the very terms, proves it does. For what is a *Kingdom* but a *Society?* And what is the *not being of this world*, but a mark of *independency?* Which indeed the Author of the *Alliance* employs to prove, that the Church and State are *independent* one of another. For was Chriſt's Religion a *Kingdom of this world*, the conſequence would be, that either the State is *dependent* on the Church, or the Church on the State; becauſe, in that caſe, both having COERCIVE POWER, (as all *kingdoms of this world* have) a mutual *independency* would make that ſoleciſm in Politics called, IMPERIUM IN IMPERIO: Whereas, *Chriſt's Kingdom not being of this World*, and *his Apoſtles*, as his Lordſhip rightly obſerves, having *no power*, (*beſides Miracles*) *but that of teaching, exhorting, and proteſting againſt infidelity*, i. e. having no *coercive* power,

Digitized by Google

there remains no pretence for its *dependency* on the State.

His Lordſhip's ſecond Argument againſt the *independency* of the Church is, that Jeſus *ſent out his Apoſtles to teach, and to baptize, and the utmoſt power he gave them, beſides that of working miracles to convince and to convert, was to ſhake off the duſt of their feet, and to proteſt againſt the infidelity of thoſe who refuſed to receive them, and the Goſpel they publiſhed. The Apoſtles ordained others to accompany and to ſucceed them in the ſame Office of teaching and baptizing. The Apoſtles could give no more power than they had received.*

1. He is to prove that Chriſtian Religion did not compoſe a Society by inſtitution. And how does he go about it? By an argument which ſhews it to be a Society by *inſtitution*, tho' without *coercive* power; the very Society which the Author of the *Alliance* contends for. *Jeſus ſent out his Apoſtles,—they ordained others to accompany and to ſucceed them.* Here muſt plainly be a Society inſtituted, where you find officers appointed, and a proviſion for their Succeſſion.—*The utmoſt power they had was to teach and baptize thoſe who willingly received the*

Digitized by Google

Goſpel. Here all *coercive* power is excluded, and that excluſion makes the Society *independent.* What more may be inferred from this account, and which his Lordſhip ſhould have inferred, is, that tho' a Society was inſtituted, yet the particular form of Church-Government was left to human appointment: But he could find no Society of Chriſt's appointment, becauſe he did not ſee a particular form of Church-Government minutely preſcribed, as in the Moſaic Diſpenſation. Tho', had he found ſuch a one, it would, when he leaſt ſuſpected it, have been moſt to his purpoſe; for of ſuch and only of ſuch, he might have ſaid truly, that being *given by God, it is in its nature invariable.*

2. His obſervation, that the *Apoſtles could give no more power than they had received,* inſinuates that the Author of the *Alliance* contended for *inherent coercive power* in the Church, which is miſrepreſenting his Adverſary, who expreſly holds, that the Church has no ſuch power, while *unallied*; and when *allied*, receives it, in a very limited manner, from the State; and enjoys it no longer than the *Alliance* continues. But theſe miſrepreſentations are things eſſential

to

Digitized by Google

to his Lordſhip's polemics. Thus again, "To pretend that the Church has a right "to the former [*i. e.* wealth and gran-"dour] by *compact* or by virtue of any "*Alliance* with the State, would be to ſay "whatever comes uppermoſt in a WHIM-"SICAL HEAD. [5]." This is to inſinuate that the Author of the *Alliance pretends that the Church has a right to wealth and grandeur, by virtue of this Alliance.* Now the Author himſelf, where he ſpeaks of the *motives* which the Church had for allying with the State, expreſly affirms, that *the acquiſition of honours, riches, and power could not be one.* His reaſon is, that *it would be impertinent in a Church to aim at them, becauſe they are things a Church could neither uſe nor profit by* [6].

His Lordſhip concludes this long paragraph in theſe words — *No argument of right can be drawn from any thing that paſſed, nor from any thing that theſe men* [the Apoſtles] *did for the maintenance of their Sect, while Chriſtianity was a Sect.* His Lordſhip here forgets, as uſual, the Perſonage he aſſumes, which is that of a Believer, who ſuppoſes, the Apoſtles acted, in all things, by the direction of their

[5] Vol. iv. p. 604. [6] *Alliance*, p. 112.

Maſter:

Digitized by Google

Master: consequently, *an argument* OF RIGHT MAY *be drawn from every thing that passed, and from all they did, in support or maintenance of their Sect while Christianity was a Sect.* It is true, if we suppose the Apostles to be Politicians like his Lordship, who put in practice all kind of means to support and maintain their Party, no argument *of right* can be drawn from any thing they did. But when God directs the action of his Ministers in the propagation of Religion, we know from his attributes, that no rights of Humanity or Society will be violated; and consequently, from every such action, *an argument of right may be drawn.*

If, indeed, his Lordship meant no more by his wise observation than this, That, from what the apostles did, to assert and maintain the *independency* of Christ's Religion, while it remained a Sect, *no argument of right can be drawn* to prove it must continue *independent* when it becomes *established*, I perfectly agree with him: and I have but one objection to the understanding him in this sense, which is, that it supports the Theory of the *Alliance*, which, I presume, was not his Lordship's intention. Besides, it

Digitized by Google

it contradicts what he ſo much labours to prove, that, if the *independency* of the Church was of divine inſtitution, the Church could not give it up, when it entered into *Alliance*.

In a word, the whole of his Lordſhip's reaſoning againſt an *Alliance between Church and State*, from the nature of a *Church*, may be reduced to theſe four propoſitions:

1. If Chriſtianity be not a Society by divine inſtitution, it is no Society at all.

2. If Chriſtianity be an independent Society by divine inſtitution, it could not give up its independency to the State.

3. If Chriſtianity be a Society by divine inſtitution, a certain form of Church government muſt be explicitly preſcribed.

4. If ſuch a form be explicitly preſcribed, then that *Form*, and the *Diſcipline* which belongs to it, muſt be as unalterable as the *Doctrine*; which is contrary to the genius of this ſuppoſed *Alliance*.

Now I have ſhewn, that every one of theſe four propoſitions is utterly devoid of all truth and reaſon.

After

Digitized by Google

After theſe exploits, nothing remained to make his Lordſhip's victory compleat againſt *Alliances* and *Eſtabliſhments*, but to diſcredit that firſt and moſt famous of all, made by CONSTANTINE. " This great Revolution " (ſays he) was effected in part by circum- " ſtances I have mentioned, and by others " that favoured the growth of Chriſtianity. " The imperial Authority did the reſt, but " did it ill, ſo ill, that the chief of thoſe poli- " tical views which CONSTANTINE had in " making this ESTABLISHMENT were de- " feated by it, and the admiſſion of a re- " ligious Society into the State, in the " manner in which he admitted it, was " the cauſe of all the eccleſiaſtical and theo- " logical evils, that have followed from " his time to ours, and that are ſo falſly " imputed to Religion itſelf. We may be " aſſured, that the SOCIETY co-operated " with the COURT, to bring about a Revo- " lution ſo much to their advantage; and " thought themſelves happy enough to be " *dependent*, not *independent* on the Em- " peror; his *inſtruments* not his *allies*, " whatever appearances he might give, or " ſuffer them to aſſume, in thoſe ſolemn " eccleſiaſtical farces, wherein he condeſ- " cended

Digitized by Google

" cended to act, in ſome reſpects, a ſe-
" cond part. — But while he recalled to
" his mind, as he did moſt probably, the
" great ſervice Religion was of to ancient
" Rome, he ſeemed to forget, that when
" that Religion flouriſhed, and was of ſo
" much ſervice to the State, it was under
" the immediate inſpection of the State.
" There was no Council but the Senate to
" define Doctrines, nor to regulate Diſci-
" pline. And men were at the head of the
" religious, becauſe they were at the head of
" the civil, adminiſtration; inſtead of being
" at the head of the latter, becauſe they
" were at the head of the former. — He
" [*Conſtantine*] meaned that this [ſpiritual
" power] ſhould be diſtinct from the civil;
" THAT THEY SHOULD BE INDEPENDENT
" OF ONE ANOTHER, and both depen-
" dent on him [7]."

That noble part of Legiſlation, the adjuſting the rights and privileges, the ſettling bounds and limits of the TWO SOCIETIES, his Lordſhip, as we ſaid before, ſeems much a ſtranger to. Indeed, every new paragraph makes his *ignorance* but the more notorious, by his trying to diſguiſe it by *Contradictions*.

[4] Vol. iv. p. 432—445.

In

In the eſtabliſhment of Religion under CONSTANTINE, the Church, he ſays, became dependent on the ſupreme civil Magiſtrate. *They thought themſelves happy enough* (ſays he) *to be dependent, not independent on the Emperor; his inſtruments, not his allies.* Yet, in the ſame breath, he tells us, that this very Emperor was contented to *act a ſecond part* to theſe his *inſtruments*, or, in other words, to become *theirs:* Nay, he expreſly affirms, that Chriſtianity was on another footing in *new* Rome, than Paganiſm had been in the *old*: Now Paganiſm, he tells us, was the *inſtrument* of the ſupreme Magiſtrate. Chriſtianity then, muſt be an *Ally*, not an *inſtrument* to the ſupreme Magiſtrate. His Lordſhip ſays, this Eſtabliſhment was *ill, very ill, made:* Be that as it will, all the world will allow it, to be here very ill repreſented.—*It defeated all Conſtantine's political views*, all the *good he intended.* This is not unlikely. We have an example before us, his Lordſhip's *Eſſays* throughout, where we find, that *contradictions* can do more; they can defeat all the *evil he intended.*

But if you aſk, Why, in this account of CONSTANTINE's eſtabliſhment, the Church is one while, made the *Inſtrument*, and another,

Digitized by Google

ther, the *Ally* of the civil Magiſtrate? I will tell you. His Lordſhip had decried the ALLIANCE both in *fact* and *right*. There never was in FACT, ſuch an Alliance, ſays his Lordſhip. To countenance this aſſertion, CONSTANTINE's *Eſtabliſhment* is repreſented as being made on different terms; terms, whereby the Church became the tool and inſtrument of the civil Magiſtrate. — But then again, he was to ſhew that ſuch an *Alliance* was not of RIGHT, as being very miſchievous to the State: This turns the Tables; and then CONSTANTINE *meaned, that the ſpiritual power ſhould be diſtinct from the civil, and that they ſhould be* INDEPENDENT OF ONE ANOTHER (for he all along miſrepreſents the Theory of the *Alliance*, as making the Church keep its *independency* after the Union) — indeed he ſays, and *both dependent on himſelf* [8]; but this was only added to ſoften the contradiction. To ſuch wretched jargon, do his Principles ever and anon reduce him: The Religious and Civil Society are independent of one another; yet the Religious is dependent on the ſupreme Magiſtrate; *i. e.* on him who repre-

[8] Vol. iv. p. 445.

ſents

Digitized by Google

ſents the civil Society, and is at it's head.

But now let us examine the ſeveral parts of this curious paragraph, without any particular regard to the contradictions.

He ſays, *the Church was happy enough to be dependent*, NOT INDEPENDENT, *on the Emperor; his Inſtruments, not his Allies.* This ſentence is made up of a *falſe inſinuation*, and a *miſtaken conſequence*. The inſinuation is that the Author of the *Alliance* holds, the *independency* of the Church, on the Magiſtrate, *dureing* an Eſtabliſhment; and that if the Church be *dependent*, it is the *Inſtrument*, not the *Ally*, of the State. The miſtaken conſequence, Grotius (as his Lordſhip finds him quoted by the Author of the *Alliance*) might have prevented. "This (ſays the Author) is what GROTIUS calls *fœdus inæquale*. Inæquale "FOEDUS, hic intelligo quod ex ipſa vi "pactionis MANENTEM PRÆLATIONEM "quandam alteri donat: Hoc eſt ubi quis "tenetur alterius imperium ac majeſtatem "conſervare, ut POTENTIORI PLUS HONORIS, inferiori plus auxilii deferatur.

Digitized by Google

" *De jur. B. & P.* L. i. c. iii. Sect. 21 [9]." Hence, in the opinion of this great Lawyer, it appears, that *alliance* and *dependence* are very conſiſtent.

In ancient Rome, ſays his Lordſhip, *there was no Council, but the Senate, to* DEFINE DOCTRINES, *nor to* REGULATE DISCIPLINE. Now in antient Rome it ſo happened, there were *no doctrines to define* [10]. And as to *Diſcipline*, it was not the *Senate*, but the Colleges of the Prieſts which *regulated* that. When the Senate imagined the neceſſities of State required the obſervance of certain Rites, they ſent to the Prieſts for their directions concerning the *regulation* of them. The ſenate might chuſe whether they would have them celebrated; but if that was their choice, they were tied down to the rules and directions of their ſacred Books.

On the whole, his Lordſhip aſſures us, that CONSTANTINE *eſtabliſhed the Church very ill*, and ſo ſays the Author of the Alliance. Nay, which is more, he explains the cauſes of it.

[9] *Alliance*, p. 88. [10] See *Div. Leg.* B. ii. Sect. 6.

His

Digitized by Google

His Lordſhip's account of *Conſtantine's* eſtabliſhment, and the Author's account of that by an *Alliance*, ſtand thus,

1. CONSTANTINE *made the church his Inſtruments, not his Allies.* The ALLIANCE makes the Church the Ally, and not the Inſtrument, of the Civil Magiſtrate.

2. CONSTANTINE *placed men at the head of the civil Adminiſtration, becauſe they were at the head of the religious.* The ALLIANCE places men at the head of the religious, becauſe they were at the head of the civil.

3. CONSTANTINE *did not take to himſelf the title of ſupreme head of the Church under God and Chriſt.* The ALLIANCE makes the ſupreme Magiſtrate, head of the Church and Defender of the Faith.

4. CONSTANTINE *gave riches and coercive power to the Church without aſſuming this ſupremacy or headſhip.* The ALLIANCE, when it gave riches and coercive power to the Church, conferred the Supremacy on the civil Magiſtrate.

His Lordſhip's concluſion from all this long ſtory of CONSTANTINE is, that "He and his Succeſſors raiſed that ſpiri-"tual tyranny, which was eſtabliſhed and

Digitized by Google

" grown into full ſtrength before " CHARLES THE GREAT [1]." And what could we expect leſs when every term in the *Alliance* was violated or neglected? This was juſt as natural as that civil Tyranny ſhould grow to a head, when the terms of the *original contract* between prince and people, had not been adverted to, or obſerved? In a word, the miſchiefs, which, his Lordſhip tells us, followed from *Conſtantine's eſtabliſhment* are the beſt recommendation of the *theory of the Alliance*; a *theory* formed, as it were, and fitted to avoid, and guard againſt, them: It has in fact done ſo, and rendered our preſent Conſtitution of Church and State the moſt happy of any upon the face of the earth.

At laſt, as if on ſet purpoſe to recommend the *Theory of the Alliance*, his Lordſhip concludes his Section concerning CONSTANTINE in theſe words: " Thus it " ſeems to me that the great and funda- " mental error, from whence ſo many " others proceeded, and which CON- " STANTINE COMMITTED IN THE ES-

[1] Vol. iv. p. 446.

" TABLISH-

Digitized by Google

" TABLISHMENT OF CHRISTIANITY, " was this, *he admitted a Clergy into an* " *eſtabliſhment, on the ſame foot, on which* " *this order had ſtood, while Chriſtianity* " *was the Religion, and theſe men were the* " *heads, the directors, the governors, and* " *magiſtrates of a Sect, by no authority,* " *but that of the Sect itſelf.* He admitted " them veſted with this authority, which " might be neceſſary as long as Chriſtians " made a Sect apart, out of the protection " of the laws; and which became un- " neceſſary and dangerous, when Chriſti- " anity had a legal eſtabliſhment. — The " conduct of Conſtantine on this occaſion " muſt needs appear extremely abſurd to " every one who conſiders the conſe- " quences it had [2]." Can there be a greater encomium on the principles of the *Alliance?* The *fundamental error* of CONSTANTINE's eſtabliſhment was, the ſuffering the Church to RETAIN IT's INDEPENDENCY. The *fundamental condition* of eſtabliſhment on the theory of *Alliance* is, that the Church GIVES UP IT's INDEPENDENCY.

[2] Vol. iv. p. 438—9.

Digitized by Google

After this, will you not wonder to hear him return again to his abuſe of the ALLIANCE? "The ſole intention and "ſole effect of it [the theologic ſyſtem of the ſchools]" was to eſtabliſh an eccleſiaſti-"cal Empire, under that ſpiritual Monarch "the Pope, and his ſpiritual Miniſters the "Clergy. THIS WAS THE EFFECT OF "THAT SUPPOSED ALLIANCE BETWEEN "THE CHURCH AND STATE [3]."

Before, it was CONSTANTINE *and his Succeſſors, who raiſed that ſpiritual Tyranny* [4]: And it was done, he ſays, by means of *his Eſtabliſhment*; which ſuffered the Church to retain its independency, *and admitted it on the ſame foot on which it had ſtood while it was a ſect* [5]. But now, it is the *ſuppoſed Alliance between Church and State* which raiſed this ſpiritual Tyranny; an *Alliance* which will not *ſuffer* the Church to retain it's independency.

We have ſeen ſuch amazing inſtances of his Lordſhip's *contradictions*, as to be ſurprized at nothing. Sometimes, when

[3] Vol. iv. p. 621—2. [4] Vol. iv. p. 446.
[5] Vol. iv. p. 438.

rapt

rapt in a fit of rhetoric, he does, by his contradictions, what the man in the Play did by his *ingratitude*, he ſtrives *to cover the monſtrous bulk of them*, by a proportionable *ſize of words*; ſometimes again he chuſes to follow the advice there given; *to let them go naked, that men may ſee them the better*. Here he formally maſks his double-face, by a premeditated falſification of the Theory of the *Alliance*: He conſtantly avouches it for a fact, or takes it for granted throughout his whole argument againſt the Book, that this Author contends for and maintains the *independency of the Church on the State, under an eſtabliſhment*. This brings CONSTANTINE's Eſtabliſhment, and the Eſtabliſhment on the principles of the ALLIANCE, pretty much to the ſame thing; ſo that the miſchiefs aſcribed to one, may be ſafely transferred to the other.

I have now, Sir, as I promiſed, given You a view of his Lordſhip's POLITICAL TALENTS. The Author whom I have defended againſt him, is no further my concern than as he afforded the occaſion. And leſt he ſhould grow vain on this ſuperior diſtinction of ſeeing himſelf pick-

Digitized by Google

ed out from amongſt the defenders of Religion, to be immolated, as it were, to the FIRST PHILOSOPHY, let me tell him, that as I defended him for want of a better, ſo his Lordſhip abuſed him, becauſe he could not find a worſe. To ſpeak plainly, his Lordſhip conceived himſelf to have been perſonally affronted by him. And to this conceit, the following words refer, where his Lordſhip takes leave of his Friend, in the laſt volume of his immortal Works, " You " have, I know, at your elbow a *very foul-* " *mouthed and very trifling Critic*, who " will endeavour to IMPOSE UPON YOU " ON THIS OCCASION, AS HE DID ON A " FORMER. He will tell you, again, that " I CONTRADICT myſelf, *&c.* But if the " *dogmatic pedant* ſhould make this ob- " jection, be pleaſed to give him this " anſwer, &c [6]."

Theſe words, you ſee, contain an anecdote; which, as I have the account of it from good hands, I ſhall not ſcruple to lay before you. It may ſerve at leaſt to entertain you, in quality of the Farce to this ſerious Piece.

[6] Vol. v. page the laſt.

Mr.

Digitized by Google

Mr. POPE had permitted Lord BOLINGBROKE to be conſidered by the public, as his PHILOSOPHER AND GUIDE; and in their converſations concerning the impious complaints againſt Providence, on account of the unequal diſtribution of things, natural and moral, in the preſent Syſtem, they agreed that ſuch complaints were beſt anſwered on the platonic principle of THE BEST. This encouraged the Poet to philoſophiſe: and the fruits of his ſpeculations may be found in the celebrated ESSAY ON MAN. In which, if you will take his Lordſhip's word, Pope was ſo far from putting his proſe into verſe, (as has been invidiouſly ſuggeſted) that he has put Pope's verſe in proſe. They agreed, as we obſerved, in the *principle of the Beſt.* And Mr. Pope thought they had agreed in the queſtion, to which this principle was to be applied. But time has ſince ſhewn, they differed very widely. The *Eſſay on Man* is a real vindication of providence, againſt Libertines and Atheiſts — The *Eſſays on the firſt Philoſophy* are a pretended vindication of Providence againſt an imaginary confederacy between Divines and Atheiſts. — The Poet directs his argument againſt

Digitized by Google

againſt Atheiſts and Libertines in ſupport of RELIGION; — The Philoſopher, againſt Divines, in ſupport of NATURALISM. But tho' his Lordſhip thought fit to keep this a ſecret from his Friend, as well as from the Public; yet, after the prodigious ſucceſs of the *Eſſay on Man*, he uſed to make the Poet, then alive and at his devotion, the frequent topic of his ridicule amongſt their common Acquaintance, as a man who underſtood nothing of his own principles, nor ſaw to what they naturally led. For the truth of this inſtance of his Lordſhip's generoſity, and virtuous emulation in friendſhip, I appeal to a right honourable Gentleman now living.

While things were in this State, M. de Crouſaz wrote ſome malignant and abſurd *remarks* on the *Eſſay on Man*; accuſing it of Spinoziſm, Naturaliſm, and all the heretical *-iſms* in the Bigot's dictionary. Theſe Remarks, by great chance, fell into the hands of the author of the *Divine Legation*. And mere indignation at an ill natured caviller, put him upon writing a defence of the *firſt epiſtle*. Which, being well received, he was induced to defend the reſt, on the ſame

Digitized by Google

ſame principles of natural and revealed Religion, againſt the blundering miſrepreſentations of this Swiſs Philoſopher, and of a certain French tranſlator of the Eſſay into verſe, by whom M. de Crouſaz had been frequently miſled.

Mr. Pope, who was *naturally* on the ſide of Religion, embraced the ſenſe given to the *Eſſay*, by his new Commentator, with the utmoſt pleaſure and ſatisfaction; as appears by the Letters he wrote on that occaſion. You will hardly ſuppoſe, his Lordſhip took the ſame delight in ſeeing his Pupil thus *reaſſumed* out of his hands: Or, (what was worſe) in ſeeing him republiſh his Eſſay with a Defence, which put the Poem on the ſide of Religion, and the Poet out of the neceſſity of ſupporting himſelf on his Lordſhip's ſyſtem, when he ſhould condeſcend to impart it to him: Or, (what was worſt of all) in ſeeing him, at the Commentator's inſtance, reſtore a great number of lines ſtruck out of the MS. which no longer left his religious ſentiments equivocal.

It was this chagrine which occaſioned his Lordſhip, (when he NEW MODELED the *introductory Letter to his Eſſays, addreſſed*

to

Digitized by Google

to Mr. Pope) to end it in this manner, " I cannot conclude my diſcourſe on this " occaſion better than by *putting you in* " *mind* of a paſſage you quoted to me *once* " with great applauſe from a ſermon of " FORSTER, and to this effect, Where " *myſtery* begins, *religion* ends. The " Apophthegm pleaſed me much, and I " was glad to hear ſuch a truth from any " pulpit, ſince it ſhews an inclination at " at leaſt, to purify Chriſtianity from the " leaven of *artificial Theology*; which con- " ſiſts principally in making things that are " very plain, myſterious; and in pretend- " ing to make things that are impenetra- " bly myſterious, very plain. *If you con-* " *tinue ſtill of the ſame mind, I ſhall have* " *no excuſe to make to you, for what I have* " *written, and ſhall write. Our opinions* " *coincide. If you have changed your mind,* " *think again and examine further.* You " will find it is the MODEST, not the PRE- " SUMPTUOUS, Enquirer who makes a real " and ſafe progreſs in the diſcovery of di- " vine truths. One follows Nature and " Nature's God; that is, he follows God " in his Works, and in his Word; nor pre- " ſumes to go further, by *metaphyſical and*

" *theological*

Digitized by Google

" *theological commentaries of his own in-*
" *vention*, than the two texts, if I may
" uſe this expreſſion, carry him very evi-
" dently. — They who have done other-
" wiſe, have been either ENTHUSIASTS or
" KNAVES [7]." *I. E.* It is I, who am the modeſt Enquirer, who follow nature and nature's God; not your preſumptuous Commentator, who is an *enthuſiaſt* or a *knave*. But alas! this kind admonition came too late. Mr. Pope had now got a better *guide* than either FORSTER or his LORDSHIP. I mean, Mr. LOCKE, who, in the concluſion of his firſt Letter to Biſhop Stillingfleet, had taught the Poet to anſwer thus, " I know not any thing
" more diſingenuous, than not publicly
" to own a conviction one has received,
" concerning any thing erroneous in what
" one has printed; nor can there, I think,
" be a greater offence againſt Mankind
" than to propagate a falſhood, whereof
" one is convinced; eſpecially in a matter
" wherein Men are highly concerned not
" to be miſled. The holy Scripture is to
" me, and always will be, the conſtant
" GUIDE of my aſſent; and I ſhall always
" hearken to it, as containing infallible

[7] Vol. iv. p. 344.

" truth,

Digitized by Google

" truth, relating to things of the higheſt
" concernment. *And I wiſh I could ſay*
" *there were no* MYSTERIES *in it. I acknow-*
" *there are, to me,* and I fear always will
" be. But where I want the evidence of
" things, there yet is ground enough for
" me to believe, becauſe God has ſaid it:
" and I ſhall preſently condemn and quit
" any opinion of mine, aſſoon as I am
" ſhewn that it is contrary to any Revela-
" tion in the holy Scripture [8]."

But the Author of the *Divine Legation* ſoon after committed a much more heinous offence againſt his Lordſhip's philoſophic Dignity. And to this, the following words, quoted above, allude: *You have, I know, at your elbow, a very foul-mouthed and a very trifling Critic, who will endeavour to impoſe upon you on this occaſion, as he did on a* FORMER.

About the year 1742, a little before Lord Bolingbroke's return to England, this *Critic* was with Mr. Pope at T. who ſhewed him a printed book of *Letters on the Study and uſe of Hiſtory*, and deſired his opinion of it. It was the firſt volume of the work ſince publiſhed under that name. Mr. W. on turning it over, told him his

[8] *Locke's Works*, Vol. i. p. 405.

Digitized by Google

thoughts of it with great freedom. What he ſaid to Mr. Pope of the main ſubject is not material: but of the digreſſion concerning the Authenticity of the Old Teſtament, he obſerved to his friend, that the Author's arguments, poor as they were, were all borrowed from other Writers; and had been confuted again and again, to the entire ſatisfaction of the learned world: that, the Author of theſe *Letters*, whoever he was, had miſtaken ſome of thoſe reaſonings; had miſrepreſented others; and had added ſuch miſtakes of his own, as muſt diſcredit him with the learned, and diſhonour him with all honeſt men: that therefore, as he underſtood the Author was his friend, he could not do him a better ſervice than adviſe him to ſtrike out this *digreſſion*, which had nothing to do with his ſubject, and would ſet half his Readers againſt the work, whenever it ſhould be publiſhed. Mr. Pope ſaid, his friend, (whoſe name he kept ſecret,) was the moſt candid of men; and that the Author of the D. L. could not do him a greater pleaſure than to tell him his thoughts freely on this occaſion. He urged this ſo warmly, that his friend complied, and, as they were then alone,

Digitized by Google

alone, ſcribled over half a dozen ſheets of paper before he roſe from the table, where they were ſitting. Mr. Pope read what he had written; and, as he had a wonderful partiality for thoſe he thought well of, he approved it: and to convince the *Scribler*, (as my Lord rightly calls him) that he did ſo, he took up the printed Volume and croſſed out the whole *digreſſion* with his pen. It was written, as you may well ſuppoſe, with all the civility, the writer was likely to uſe to a friend Mr. Pope appeared much to reverence: but the word *prevarication*, or ſomething like it, chanced, it ſeems, to eſcape his pen. The papers were ſent to Paris; and received with unparalleled indignation. Little broke out; but ſomething did; and Mr. Pope found he had not paid his court by this officious ſervice. However, with regard to the Writer of the papers, all was carried, when his Lordſhip came over (as he ſoon afterwards did,) with ſingular politeneſs; and ſuch a ſtrain of compliment as men are wont to beſtow on thoſe, whoſe homage they intend to gain. Yet all this time, his Lordſhip was meditating and compiling an angry and elaborate anſwer to this private, haſty, and impertinent,

Digitized by Google

tho' well meant, *Scribble:* and it was as much as They could do, who had moſt intereſt with him, to perſuade him at length to burn it. For the truth of all this, I might appeal to a noble Perſon, one of the greateſt Characters of this, or indeed, of any Age; who being much courted by his Lordſhip, was for ſome time able, and at all times moſt deſirous, of reſtraining the extravagance of that *firſt Philoſophy*, which he deteſted and deſpiſed.

The event has ſince ſhewn, that it had been happy for his Lordſhip's reputation, had the advice, to ſtrike out the *Digreſſion*, been followed; as it is that which has chiefly ſunk him in the popular opinion; and loſt him the merit of the very beſt of all his Compoſitions.

Mr. Pope, however, was ſtill courted and careſſed. And the vengeance treaſured up againſt him for the impiety of eraſing thoſe ſacred pages, broke not out till the Poet's death: then indeed it came with redoubled vehemence, and on the moſt ridiculous pretence. Pope had, as his Lordſhip ſaid, unknown to him, printed an Edition of the *Patriot Prince*, or *Patriot King*, (for it had two titles, as his Lordſhip's various occaſions required) a

Digitized by Google

very innocent thing, which might have been publiſhed by the common Cryer, without the leaſt offence. To ſay the truth, it was a mere School-declamation, which, in great pomp of words, informs us of this Secret, *That if a Prince could but be once brought to love his Country he would always act for the good of it.* There was the appearance too of very odd practice to give a colour of neceſſity for the publiſhing this wonderful diſcovery. However, it was done; and the memory of Pope traduced in ſo cruel a manner, that the Reader is ſuffered to conclude, that even CURL himſelf could not have acted a more faithleſs or mercenary part: for it muſt be owned, his Lordſhip has dealt one equal meaſure to his COUNTRY, his RELIGION, and his FRIEND. And why was all this outrage? To ſpeak the worſt of the offence, it was one of thoſe private offices of indiſcreet good will, which generous men are always ready to forgive, even when they ſee themſelves moſt incommoded by it.

The Public ſtood amazed. And thoſe who had any regard for the Poet's Memory, waited with impatience to ſee who, of his *old* Friends, would reſcue it from his Lordſhip's

Digitized by Google

Lordſhip's fangs. Contempt of ſo cruel a treatment, I ſuppoſe, kept them ſilent. However, the ſame contempt at length provoked an Anonymous Writer to publiſh a Letter to the *Editor of the Patriot King*; for his Lordſhip had thought proper to divide himſelf into the two perſonages of *Editor* and *Author*. This Letter, written with all the decorum and reſpect due to his Lordſhip's Station and Character, he thought fit to aſcribe to the Author of the *Divine Legation*; ſo that you need not wonder if it expoſed the ſuſpected writer to all his Lordſhip's rage, and to all the ribaldry of his Sycophants; of which, ſome, that was ſaid to paſs through his Lordſhip's hands, was in language bad enough to diſgrace Goals and Garrets.

You have here, SIR, the Anecdote I promiſed you. And now I ſhall releaſe you from this tedious Subject. I have compleated my *View of his Lordſhip's Philoſophy*; which I choſe to addreſs to You in compliance with his challenge; where he appeals, from *Artificial Theology* and *School-Learning*, to the breaſt of the plain honeſt Man,

"Slave to no Sect, who takes no private road,
"But looks through nature up to nature's God;

to

Digitized by Google

to him whose heart is filled with the love of God and Man. To this Tribunal he appeals, and to this I have now brought him. What he will gain by it You will tell us. I greatly suspect, that of all his Principles you are not likely to approve more than what you find in the following declaration, which breaks out unexpectedly from amidst the corruption of party politics, and in all likelyhood was ingendered by them. SOME MEN THERE ARE, THE PESTS OF SOCIETY I THINK THEM, WHO PRETEND A GREAT REGARD TO RELIGION IN GENERAL, BUT WHO TAKE EVERY OPPORTUNITY OF DECLAIMING PUBLICKLY AGAINST THAT SYSTEM OF RELIGION, OR AT LEAST AGAINST THAT CHURCH-ESTABLISHMENT, WHICH IS RECEIVED IN BRITAIN [2].

I am, &c.

[2] *Dissertation on Parties*, p. 148. 8vo. Edit.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

P. 136. l. 15. for *haman* read *human*.
P. 159. l. last, for *natural* read *national*.
P. 174. l. 23. for *bounds* read *the bounds*.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google